

Binding

The Department of State

bulletin

Vol. XXX, No. 376

May 2, 1946



| | |
|--|-----|
| A FIRST STEP TOWARD THE PEACEFUL USE OF ATOMIC ENERGY • <i>by Louis L. Stevenson</i> | 639 |
| OBSERVANCE OF PAN AMERICAN DAY • <i>by Assistant Secretary Halliday</i> | 671 |
| THE QUEST FOR TRUTH THROUGH FREEDOM OF INFORMATION • <i>Statements by President Roosevelt</i> | 682 |
| AMERICANS ABROAD • <i>Article by Elizabeth J. Culligan</i> | 692 |

Published by the Department of State



The Department of State bulletin

VOL. XXX, No. 775 • PUBLICATION 5452

May 3, 1954

The Department of State BULLETIN a weekly publication issued by the Public Services Division, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes selected press releases on foreign policy, issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, as well as legislative material in the field of international relations, are listed currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U. S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D. C.

PRICE:

52 issues, domestic \$7.50, foreign \$10.25
Single copy, 20 cents

The printing of this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (January 22, 1952).

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

A First Step Toward the Peaceful Use of Atomic Energy

by *Lewis L. Strauss*

*Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission*¹

The technical limitations of photography in 1863 spared Abraham Lincoln the daily exhortations of "Just one more, Mr. President," but it would have been an intensely interesting archive for this generation to be able to see the expressive face of the great President—for instance, just as he had delivered his address at Gettysburg. The ubiquitous camera no longer spares our Presidents. There is a flashlight photograph of President Eisenhower taken within a few moments after he had resumed his seat in the great assembly hall of the United Nations and just as the prolonged applause had begun—applause which is almost unknown in that august chamber and which was the precursor of the worldwide acclaim that greeted his historic address.² The picture is a very moving one. It is the face of a man who had succeeded in communicating his profoundest convictions to his hearers while they were responding spontaneously and with obvious feeling. What may well be a great moment in the history of the world is recorded and epitomized in that photograph.

By now a great deal has been said about the December 8th address. It was not a hastily put together speech. It is true that the invitation to appear before the General Assembly of the United Nations was only received while the President was in Bermuda and it presented an appropriate, indeed an ideal, forum for the occasion. But the speech itself had been long in composition and even longer in the President's mind. Every paragraph, every word in it, had been weighed and considered by him. He had written and rewritten it and could have delivered it had he cared to do so without benefit of manuscript.

Like other great addresses, it was not long—only some 3,000 words. Edward Everett's oration at Gettysburg on the famous day in 1863 took up-

wards of an hour to deliver and is forgotten. President Eisenhower's brief speech had two major purposes. One was to tell the world in the new language of the atomic age of what humanity faced if it could not escape another war. The other purpose was to propose an alternative to the headlong race of nations toward that precipice.

The first part was roughly two-thirds of the speech. In measured phrases which could not be misunderstood, the President described the force of the new weapons with which science and engineering had stocked the military arsenals of at least three nations. He said that he sought that day to speak in a language which he would have preferred never to use, the new language of atomic warfare. "Atomic bombs," he said, "today are more than 25 times as powerful as the weapons with which the atomic age dawned, while hydrogen weapons are in the ranges of millions of tons of TNT equivalent." He continued, "Today, the United States' stockpile of atomic weapons, which, of course, increases daily, exceeds by many times the explosive equivalent of the total of all bombs and all shells that came from every plane and every gun in every theatre of war in all of the years of World War II."

But so profound was the effect of the latter part of the address, so great the yearning of the world for some light in the gathering gloom of an atomic armament race, so welcome any hope for reducing the threat of atomic destruction by any amount or means, that there was surprisingly little note of the content of the first part of the address. It was, in fact, overshadowed in both news and editorial reaction.

The current series of weapons tests at our Pacific Proving Ground, however, has effectively dramatized the earlier part of the speech. I hope it has reminded many who had almost forgotten the fact that the Soviets tested a thermonuclear device in August of last year. A little examination of the calendar also reveals that, had we not begun our researches when we did, we might now be in a position of weapon inferiority to the Soviet

¹ Address made before the Los Angeles World Affairs Council on Apr. 19; released to the press on the same date by the Atomic Energy Commission.

² BULLETIN of Dec. 21, 1953, p. 847.

Union—a condition with consequences of disastrous weight for the future of the presently free world.

I would like to speak to you about both parts of that address, retrospectively about why we made A-bombs, why we decided to make H-bombs, and, if the time permits, about what, in my humble judgment, lies ahead. It is an extensive catalog, and I know that I can only treat each part briefly.

Genesis of President's Plan

To begin with, we in the United States undertook to make the atomic bomb because we had good reason to believe that the Germans were working on it. It was clear that we had no recourse but to see that we were not outstripped in armament, especially by a nation as irresponsibly and belligerently led as Hitler Germany. After we made the bomb, we used it. We used it to bring the war with Japan to an abrupt close and then rested on our military and scientific achievements.

The next step—our offer to share our monopoly with the world—despite its lack of success was one of the most satisfactory and proud pages of American history. It was satisfactory because its motivation was altogether meritorious. The blame for our failure to exorcise this blight on the lives of our generation must be placed by history squarely where it belongs, on the heads and hands of the men in the Kremlin. In cynical but effective fashion, they used every diplomatic stratagem to delay, confuse, and destroy the proposal. In this they succeeded. It now appears that it may well have been because they had atomic weapon plans of their own.

The failure, therefore, of the Baruch proposals left the United States with no alternative but to press forward with the development of its atomic arsenal, and this too was done.

The Soviet achievement of atomic weapon capability eventuated sooner than most had expected—much sooner. Our intelligence arrangements, fortunately inaugurated in time, enabled us to know almost as quickly as the Russian high command and months before the Russian people learned that a test had been made. We announced it on September 23, 1949.³

The Soviets conducted further tests in the autumn of 1951 and again last summer. That last series began with a very large explosion in which we were able to say that a thermonuclear reaction had occurred, that is, the fusion of nuclei of light elements.

I have already referred to the cataclysmic possible consequences of this test had we been unready for its impact. Fortunately, we were prepared. When the fact that the Soviets had an atomic bomb capability was demonstrated in 1949 and

with negotiations for international control and inspection deadlocked by them, President Truman took a decision. He was aware that a lead in numbers of weapons—a quantitative superiority which we believed that we then enjoyed—even if we were sure that we could hold it would become of less and less importance relatively until it was meaningless. Our only hope was to maintain the status quo by having a qualitative superiority. The President gave the order to the Commission on January 31, 1950, to proceed with work on what was then generally called the "super" bomb, that is to say, a weapon employing as its chief source of energy the principle of nuclear fusion rather than of nuclear fission.

The success of American scientists and engineers in this new effort is by now well known, and we have no less an authority than Sir Winston Churchill for the considered opinion that it has been our continued possession of weapon superiority which has preserved the world from further large-scale aggression and another bath of blood.

Imagine the condition if we did not possess retaliatory power which neutralized the great Soviet manpower plus their atomic weapon potential. With that power possessed or usable by them alone, they could exert authority over small adjacent nations with the whole world eventually ending up in the maw of communism and slavery.

The alternative, however, of "two atomic colossi . . . doomed malevolently to eye each other indefinitely across a trembling world," which was the vivid metaphor used by the President, is likewise an unacceptable condition though to a far less degree than the consequence of submission to communism. Because it represents an instability which could be triggered into a war of great destruction, President Eisenhower had given the subject long and concerned thought.

Out of his deliberations came the conviction that a new factor, a new dimension, would have to be emphasized before any hope could be entertained. *The answer lay in the atom itself, in its latent power to become not the master and destroyer but the servant of man.*

This was the genesis of the President's proposal and its first great virtue is that it can be undertaken "without the irritations and mutual suspicions incident to any attempt to set up a completely acceptable system of world-wide inspection and control."

You will recall the heart of his proposal was that the governments principally concerned to the extent permitted by elementary prudence should begin now and continue to make joint contributions from their stockpiles of normal uranium and fissionable materials to an International Atomic Energy Agency. He envisaged that agency as established under the aegis of the United Nations. Such details as the ratio of contributions, the procedures, etc., he felt should be discussed in "private conversations" between the contracting parties.

³ *Ibid.*, Oct. 3, 1949, p. 487.

He assured the delegates of the nations to whom he was addressing himself that any partners of the United States, acting in good faith with us, would find us not unreasonable or ungenerous.

Conversations in Progress

Private conversations have ensued. There is an impression I find—probably because these conversations are private—that nothing is going on and that the proposal is dormant. This is not the case. The President's idea has been formulated into a concrete plan. The plan has been discussed with certain friendly governments. Just one month ago today it was handed to the Soviet Ambassador in Washington for transmittal to his Government. This step followed the private conversations which had begun in January and were continued by Secretary Dulles when the Foreign Ministers met in Berlin.

Why did the members of the Soviet delegation in the audience at the United Nations, caught off their guard, applaud with all the other delegates there present? And why after the first reactions of denegation and disdain did the Soviet Government at last respond? The answer to that must have been because of the impact of what followed. For the President had said:

The United States would seek more than the mere reduction or elimination of atomic materials for military purposes. It is not enough to take this weapon out of the hands of the soldiers. It must be put into the hands of those who will know how to strip its military casing and adapt it to the arts of peace. The United States knows that if the fearful trend of atomic military buildup can be reversed, this greatest of destructive forces can be developed into a great boon, for the benefit of all mankind. The United States knows that peaceful power from atomic energy is no dream of the future. That capability, already proved, is here—now—today. Who can doubt, if the entire body of the world's scientists and engineers had adequate amounts of fissionable material with which to test and develop their ideas, that this capability would rapidly be transformed into universal, efficient, and economic usage.

At this point, I am privileged to state that it is the President's intention to arrange through a national scientific organization to convene an international conference of scientists at a later date this year. This conference, which it is hoped will be largely attended and will include the outstanding men in their professions from all over the world, will be devoted to the exploration of the benign and peaceful uses of atomic energy. It will be the first time that any such body has been convoked, and its purpose, also in the words of the President, will be "to hasten the day when the fear of the atom will begin to disappear from the minds of people, and the governments of the East and West."

What Is the President's Proposal?

A few moments ago I mentioned the fact that the President's proposal had been formulated into

a plan. It might be useful to state something affirmative about what the proposal is and is not to give a frame of reference within which the practical potentials of a World Atomic Bank can be discussed.

The United States proposal is *not* just another move in the chess game of world politics nor is it primarily a disarmament formula. It does *not* endanger the atomic-weapons secrets of any nation that now has or may possess such secrets.

It does *not* involve suddenly placing trust where yesterday trust could not be reposed. Implementing the proposal requires no reliance upon impossible enforcement provisions nor does it depend on an interpretation of good faith.

It is *not* a prescription for technical alleviation of disease that still scourges too many parts of the world nor will it in a day—or a year—solve the desperate struggle for daily bread where that now exists. It will *not*, on any precisely measurable timetable, turn deserts into lush meadows nor provide the energy to lift grinding toil from the backs of those now living in underdeveloped areas.

The accumulative effect of the operation of the proposed agency *will do these things*:

It *will* accelerate the application of peaceful uses of the atom everywhere.

It *will* divert amounts of fissionable material from atomic bomb arsenals to uses which will benefit mankind, and these amounts will steadily increase as long as the peace is maintained.

It *will* foster the dissemination of information for peaceful uses to atomic scientists everywhere.

It *will* stimulate the acquisition of new fundamental data and theory on which all progress depends.

It *will* provide an opportunity for nations which are atomic have-nots, either individually or by combining with others, to acquire atomic facilities best suited to their individual needs.

It *will* increase man's knowledge of his own body and that of the plants and animals that nourish him and the insects and pests that threaten him, to the end that the healing art will be advanced and new ways found to increase the world's food supply. And man's useful life span will be prolonged.

It *will* encourage young and imaginative minds in many countries to seek useful careers in the new disciplines of science and engineering to the end that they may contribute to improving the economy and living standards of their respective countries.

And, perhaps most important of all, the successful operation of the International Atomic Energy Agency will contribute mightily to focusing world attention and understanding on the potential of atomic energy to enrich the lives of all of us and thus dispel some of today's doubts and fears that its only use would be to destroy us.

Only in the last few days legislation has been introduced designed to amend the Atomic Energy Act in part to facilitate the President's plan.

Moreover, in the hearings when they take place on the measure and on possible declassification of data regarding industrial utilization of atomic energy, we will be prepared to answer satisfactorily any questions about the impairment of the security of information. I would not be here tonight if I felt that America's participation in the International Atomic Energy Agency need endanger any secrets vital to our national defense.

Prospects for Many Applications

It has been less than 12 years since the power of the atom was harnessed within a nuclear reactor. In that brief interval, the achievements in peaceful uses of its energy have been varied and important. Here in the United States these results have come along steadily and in increasing numbers despite our necessary concentration on military applications in behalf of our own defense and the defense of the free world.

There is no need here to inventory in detail the multiple applications of atomic energy which we have already found in the areas of medicine, biology, agriculture, and industry. We need only to note that, notwithstanding, the surface has barely been scratched. Progress has also been made in other countries where the imaginations of men have been fired by the problems and the possibilities.

I do wish to emphasize a less widely known aspect of atomic progress—the advances in new fundamental knowledge. We have seen almost a dozen new elements isolated, identified, and fitted into the periodic table. In this still young art, we have witnessed the confirmation of the principle of breeding atomic fuel. Successful application of this principle will greatly extend the use of the normal uranium which would be contributed to the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Such advances in fundamental knowledge will be one of the high purposes of the new atomic agency. It is no risky extrapolation from what we now know to prophesy that in time—whether it be a few years or a decade or a generation—there will come discoveries to enrich the lives of all of us fully as important as those we have already witnessed.

Atomic Energy as a Source of Power

Near the end of his speech, the President said, "A special purpose [of the International Atomic Energy Agency] would be to provide abundant electrical energy in the power-starved areas of the world." There has been a very substantial recent development in this area. I would recall to you that within the last year the Atomic Energy Commission in testimony before congressional committees felt it necessary to discount the possibility that, under foreseeable conditions, there was any prospect for the large-scale investment of private

capital in the development of nuclear power until the Commission had demonstrated its economic feasibility.

Today, less than one year since that statement, we have had nine proposals from large companies and groups of companies to undertake to build and operate the first large civilian power plant. It has been awarded to one, the Duquesne Light Company of Pittsburgh, whose proposal will save the Government some \$30 million of the cost of its construction and operations. Other companies also see the possibility of getting in on the development of nuclear power even at this early and economically undemonstrated stage, and other projects are under discussion with them.

This is an important milestone in the short life history of atomic energy. Competent engineers say that fossil fuel reserves, at least those that constitute presently available sources of supply, are rapidly dwindling. In Europe and elsewhere, nuclear power is now envisaged as the most promising energy source for the future.

Here, then, lies one ready opportunity for the proposed new atomic energy agency.

To me, the kind of thinking that would be stimulated by the mobilization of scientific and engineering minds, which should result from the operation of the world bank of atomic materials, would be unlimited since it is geared to man's imagination and his resourcefulness.

A Hopeful First Step

For the first time since the discovery of fire, we have come into possession of a force with which we can enrich our lives incalculably or, failing to make that choice, we can wreck a large part of what we have inherited from the accumulated art, heart, and spirit of the generations that preceded us.

In an effort to temper optimism, yet preserve the great faith that the President's plan deserves, I have mentioned its immediate limitations. It will not be within its scope to cure the ills of the world with a single stroke, and it does not pretend to insure against future war. It would be unfortunate if it were represented as other than what it is, for that is so very much—an understandable, reasonable, feasible, constructive, and hopeful first step toward making atomic energy the servant of man.

My old chief, former President of the United States Herbert Hoover, to whose Quaker convictions the possibilities of warfare are so fundamentally revolting, after listening to President Eisenhower's speech, said, "I pray it may be accepted by all the world." We may well join our prayers to his to ask that Divine Providence guide the hearts and minds of all men of all nations to grasp this opportunity to "shake off the inertia imposed by fear, and . . . make positive progress toward peace."

Americans Abroad

by Francis J. Colligan

"The heart of American foreign policy is our national conduct," Secretary of State John Foster Dulles has said, "and that is a matter not just for our diplomats but for every individual among us." These words are particularly applicable to those who travel abroad.

They confirm, among other things, what the President said last fall when speaking at New Orleans.¹ On that occasion, he remarked,

I think that almost any American traveling abroad these days experiences occasionally a sense of shock when he recalls an opinion about Americans in general held abroad that seems to that American visitor to be so far from the truth. He finds Americans considered immature diplomatically; impulsive, too proud of their strength, ready to fight, wanting war. He is shocked. . . . These friendships of which I speak, my friends, are so vital to us that no American, no matter how exalted or how lowly may be his station, can afford to ignore them. Each of us, whether bearing a commission from his Government or traveling by himself for pleasure or for business, is a representative of the United States of America and he must try to portray America as he believes it in his heart to be: a peace-loving nation living in the fear of God but in the fear of God only, and trying to be partners with our friends. And we accept for a friend anyone who genuinely holds out the hand of friendship to us as we do to them.

These views are, in effect, documented by two recent studies made by the International Educational Exchange Service of the Department of State. One study involved asking more than 200 Americans who had studied in Great Britain for their comments on Anglo-American relations as they had observed them. In listing the major causes of misunderstanding of America by the British, 80 mentioned "the tendency to generalize from the observation of tourists . . . and certain other Americans." To describe such travelers, the students used such phrases as "noisy and rather naïve," "ill-mannered and drunk," "thoughtless and ostentatious," especially in spending money, and "depressingly ignorant in their disregard of local customs and modes of behavior." On the other hand, most were impressed by the spirit of personal friendliness which prevailed between Americans and British-

ers, and several stated that "the British like Americans but not America."

The second study was based upon a question put last year to more than 1,000 foreign students in the United States. They were asked where they got their advance information about this country. Eighteen percent mentioned American visitors as a major source of information. Many others certainly pick up various notions about America from the attitude or behavior of our travelers as they see them.

These studies and others like them indicate that international travel is, potentially at least, the most effective mode of contact between peoples. It not only provides badly needed dollars to dollar-short countries (in some, tourism is the best dollar-earner); it can also contribute substantially to a truthful, factual balanced picture of the United States in the minds of the peoples of other countries. This is especially significant today when public opinion can be such a vital force in international relations and when Americans are seen abroad largely as travelers and especially as tourists.

American travelers to foreign lands have been few in number, at least in comparison with Europeans. The distance of the outsize island which is the United States from most other countries and the consequent amount of time and money required for travel have limited the number and types of travelers, the duration and extent of their trips, and the nature and scope of their activities. Most trips take place during the summer months and most are relatively brief. The large proportion of those in educational pursuits who undertake international travel—more than 50,000 in 1952—is due, partly at least, to the fact that such people have free time during the summer.

The worker, the merchant, or the businessman, despite the fact that his resources may be at least equal to those of his foreign counterpart, still has little time for travel even when it is directly connected with his business. It is probable that very many American travelers pay only one visit to a foreign country not immediately adjacent to the United States. American travelers have been a

¹ BULLETIN of Oct. 26, 1953, p. 539.

relatively select group with specific purposes in mind, and this selectivity and purpose by its very nature may skew the picture of American life, motives, and attitudes which they have presented abroad.

It is remarkable and very encouraging that travel abroad is steadily increasing. During the first half of 1953, 269,918 passports were issued, as compared with 145,516 for the similar period in 1952. It was estimated that international travelers last year would total about 600,000. One reason for the increase is the speedup in transportation, enabling people with only a few days or weeks to travel fairly far in the time at their disposal. This should lead in turn to more group rates—and lower rates. The net effect should be to broaden the type and range of American travelers and thus show a more representative cross section of our people to our friends overseas.

The mere increase of such travel, however, will not in itself improve the impression we make on our hosts abroad nor foster that awareness of our responsibilities as Americans which President Eisenhower has pointed out. It is safe to assume that increases will largely be in the tourist trade, and the tourist, whose purpose is frequently novelty-seeking or just relaxation, is least apt to want his fun curtailed by an admonition to be "serious." Moreover, face-to-face contact with others is not in itself a guarantee of understanding, cooperation, or friendship. On the other hand, such contact can help a lot, and travel when properly oriented can contribute significantly to the effectiveness of our working with and trading understanding with other peoples. What then can be done to take advantage of this unusual source of personal contacts for the purpose of presenting a full and fair picture of American life and motives in ways which are appropriate in a free society, marked not by governmental decrees but by private initiative and personal independence? As a matter of fact, much is already being done and it is possible for interested groups to learn from the experience of others while adding to it on their own.

American travelers constitute at first sight a complex, undifferentiated flow of traffic. They represent all kinds of people, from accountants to writers; they travel abroad for various purposes. Of the 395,337 who received passports during 1952, nearly 200,000 planned to travel on business; 29,000 sought "education"; and almost 144,000 proposed to travel for travel's sake—to relax, to satisfy their curiosity, to see the "cities of many men and know their manners." Most of them—more than 300,000—were to visit Western Europe, 43,000 Latin America, and only some 34,000 planned to visit other areas of the world. (Traffic with our nearest neighbors, Canada and Mexico, and with some other countries, is not reflected in these figures since passports are often not needed.)

What Is Being Done

During the past few years, much has been done to make the trips of Americans abroad more significant. To sketch some of these efforts briefly, we should distinguish, first of all, between two groups: (1) individual travelers and (2) those whose trips are organized and sponsored.

Individual travelers constitute a sizeable majority of the total number. How and to what extent they prepare themselves for trips abroad depends entirely upon their own initiative, temperament, and intelligence, their awareness of the values of foreign travel, and their interest in world affairs. However, a growing amount of helpful and stimulating literature is now at their disposal. Articles in newspapers and magazines have been increasing—articles which go beyond the traditional "travel guide" type to suggest constructive interests and responsible conduct while abroad. Typical of the trend is Leland Stowe's "The Knack of Intelligent Travel" which appeared originally in the *Reader's Digest* and which has been reprinted in at least one travel guide. Some guides now include hints, suggestions, and downright exhortations along the same line. Notable among them is the 3-volume *New World Guides* which, in addition to the usual data, contains a chapter on the Organization of American States.

There are also several pamphlets which place particular stress upon the need for a special sense of responsibility on the part of Americans while traveling abroad. One which has been issued by Pan American World Airways is entitled *How to Win Friends and Influence People in Latin America*. Another issued by the International Information Administration (now the United States Information Agency) is entitled *Go to Latin America with a Purpose*. A memorandum on "The Tourist's Ten Commandments" has been circulated by the Pan American Union. Others range beyond this hemisphere. *What Should I Know When I Travel Abroad?*, published by the Common Council for American Unity, has been distributed widely to prospective travelers by transportation companies and travel agencies. A helpful booklet, *Travel Abroad*, has been given wide circulation by UNESCO. The principal theme of much of this literature is stated succinctly in the quotation from a congressional committee report, which appears in the pamphlet which the Department of State issues with every passport:

"Tourists who assume an air of arrogance or who transcend the common bonds of decency in human conduct can do more in the course of an hour to break down elements of friendly approach between peoples than the Government can do in the course of a year in trying to stimulate friendly relations. As we act so are we judged, words to the contrary notwithstanding, and it is fervently to be hoped that our citizen travelers will have a growing appreciation of this fact and deport themselves in a manner befitting their station and training." Here, as elsewhere, what we do is more important than what we say.

How effective such literature has been to date is difficult to determine precisely. There is every reason to believe, however, that its publication is worthwhile, a conclusion which is bolstered by the ever greater efforts which have been made in the field of organized travel.

Organized, sponsored travelers are numerous, and their number is increasing. They include those who take part in group tours arranged by travel agencies and those who participate in highly organized trips sponsored by private groups or by the Government, with systematic activities and specific objectives in mind. In the first group, those organized by travel agencies for "self-selected" persons, increasing attention is being given to the preparation of the travelers, at least as regards such information as conditions of travel abroad and local customs and regulations. Such preparation at the very least makes travel itself easier and may, therefore, develop a better oriented and more receptive visitor. Some plans go further. One, for example, is that of the American Express Company, for members of the Book-of-the-Month Club. Those who plan to take part in one of a series of vacation tours receive from the Club—free of charge—a kit of carefully selected books about the countries and regions to be visited. These kits include not only guide books but also surveys of the history, customs, and ways of life of the countries to be visited.

Such activities, however, are not confined to reading matter. Some universities, through extension courses, offer courses to prepare people for travel abroad, and travel companies and others are offering "package tours."

A recent newspaper article notes, as a new trend, planned travel to Europe and Latin America based on bringing American tourists into contact with people of similar interests in the countries visited—be they lawyers, farmers, coal miners, or automobile salesmen.

Sponsored travelers are usually those who wish to travel for specific and relatively serious purposes. The well-known programs of the Institute of International Education and the philanthropic foundations need only be mentioned here. The "Junior Year Abroad" programs of several colleges are in the same class. Of special interest in this field are the interchange projects arranged by the 4-H Club Foundation—the International Farm Youth Exchange, which every year sends abroad groups of young Americans from rural areas to spend several months on farms in the host countries and brings young people to the United States for similar purposes. Top-flight musical and theatrical artists and groups also are becoming increasingly aware of the role they can and do play in projecting the cultural achievements of America to foreign audiences—for example, *Porgy and Bess* tours, those of the Ballet Theatre, those sponsored by the American National Theatre

and Academy (ANTA). Among them, they make an impressive story and an inspiring one.

Aside from these, most sponsored travel projects are of relatively short duration and for the summer months. They have various purposes and exhibit varying degrees of organization. In many, the participants are self-selected; in others they are chosen and financed in whole or in part by sponsors. Some offer definite professional advantages to professional people—for example, the trips arranged by the National Education Association for teachers. Here the participants are largely self-selected but trips follow a definite plan for the cultivation of professional contacts and earn academic credit for their participants. Planned travel of another type is that sponsored by the General Federation of Women's Clubs. The Federation has conducted several world-cooperation tours, two inter-American cooperation trips, and a field seminar in Mexico, all in the last 2 years. Some of the participants were self-selected; others were chosen for the specific purposes of the tour. As a result of these trips, the Federation has published a pamphlet, *How to Make Friends and Capture Memories*, containing, among other things, a list of "do's and don'ts" of travel.

By far the most numerous in this group are those on work-study tours. The National Student Association, for example, has sponsored such trips and has issued information booklets each year on work, study, and travel projects. Other types of projects have included hostel and work-camp activities, and the Community Ambassador Project of the Bureau of Adult Education of New York State. All these work-study projects are organized for specific purposes. Most, if not all, of them include as an objective, implicitly or explicitly, the development of international cooperation and understanding through personal contact and constructive, worthwhile activity. The acceptance, screening, or selection of travelers is made with this, among other things, in mind. A considerable amount of careful advance preparation, including literature and oral briefings, is undertaken. In most cases, travel and activities overseas are also guided and supervised. Many sponsors carefully evaluate their activities with an eye to constant improvement.

Many projects sponsored by nonprofit organizations are coordinated by the Council on Student Travel. The Council got its start from the action of the State Department's old Division of Exchange of Persons which in 1947, in response to widespread demands to break the "bottleneck" in low-cost summer travel for students, cooperated with the Maritime Commission in making available troop transports operated at commercial rates by the U.S. Lines. While this effort of the Government lasted only until 1950, it sparked the formation of the Council which, with the assist-

ance of the Carnegie Endowment, has sent abroad about 5,000 students annually. Representing directly some 36 organizations and serving many others, including universities and religious groups, it gives information and advice, suggests improvements in itineraries and travel programs, and especially provides shipboard orientation to prepare students for living in cultures different from their own.

An appraisal of summer projects made some time ago by the International Educational Exchange Service of the Department of State indicated that most of them are well organized and conducted under able and experienced leadership. It was obvious that the participants had benefited and that they had made a favorable impression on the people they met overseas.

Appraisals like these reflect the interest which the International Educational Exchange Service takes in travel projects. Because of their significance for international cooperation on a broad, popular level, this Service works with hundreds of such sponsoring organizations every year, offering, on request, advice and direction and arranging where possible for predeparture orientation and for assistance from the U. S. Information Service in the countries to be visited by the groups. In so doing, it is following a time-honored principle of encouraging the widest possible development of worthwhile exchange projects by private, nongovernmental groups and organizations, and of fostering close cooperation between the public and our Government in this field.

Educational Exchange Programs

This cooperation is also reflected in the educational exchange programs financed in whole or in part by our Government and administered through this Service. Under these programs, private, unofficial travelers going abroad will number about 1,800 people this year. Most of them will stay abroad for 1 year. Nearly 1,000 will be engaged in advanced study; the remainder will teach in elementary and secondary schools, lecture in educational and professional institutions and before general audiences, undertake professional research, or give specialized assistance to foreign organizations and agencies. All of them will be carefully selected in the light of the specific purposes of their projects and of the fundamental purposes of the program, as expressed in the Smith-Mundt Act,

... to promote a better understanding of the United States in other countries, and to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries.

For those persons who go abroad under this program, advance preparation takes the form of informational literature and suggested background readings prepared by the cultural sections of our posts abroad or by the United States Educa-

tional Foundations or Commissions established under the Fulbright Act. Such literature includes not only information on currencies, clothes, climate, etc., but also summaries of local laws and customs, hints on differences in ways of life, suggestions regarding local contacts, and other comment which looks beyond immediate professional pursuits, however important for the program they may be, to the fundamental goal of international cooperation and understanding.

Most of the orientation of these persons takes place after they arrive in the host countries. It follows plans developed by our missions and foundations. These may vary from individual personal orientation for certain specialists to systematic orientation courses of from 2 to 6 weeks for groups of students. Such courses include the study of customs, educational system, and social institutions of the host countries. In several countries they include intensive instruction in the national language as well—for example, those offered to students in Italy at the University of Perugia or in Norway at the Summer School for American Studies at the University of Oslo. Nor does such orientation cease with "introductory" courses or briefings. It merges with other activities and supervision to constitute a year-round process of counseling, supervising, guiding, and facilitating the work of the grantees under the program.

By the very nature of the activities undertaken, as well as by their relatively long duration, grantees are brought into constant contact with their occupational or professional counterparts and with many others also. An indication of how this works out in personal terms may be seen from the following example:

An American student in Thailand reported that he had visited about 125 different Chinese and Thai homes. "In most cases, I was the first Westerner, and certainly the first American to have entered their homes. My reception was in all instances exceptionally friendly. . . . I would judge that this was one of the few ways these people had to get the American point of view."

For these reasons, among others, their impact is often pervasive, penetrating, and lasting, especially among groups which influence public opinion. Although a large percentage of these grantees travel to Europe, more of them travel to other areas of the world than do American travelers generally.

That careful planning, preparation, and arrangements are worthwhile is seen by the results. In general, American grantees return to the United States with a greatly enriched background and with an understanding of foreign attitudes and reactions to American life, motives, and policies. Our overseas missions report that the grantees through ability, seriousness, and fairness, leave the impression among the people with

whom they have lived that in international affairs Americans wish to be sincere partners with, as the President has said, "anyone who holds out the hand of friendship to us as we do to them."

These appraisals have been amplified and confirmed by such recent studies as those undertaken by the Senate Subcommittee on the Operation of Overseas Information Programs (the Hickenlooper Committee), including the reaction of American Ambassadors, foreign correspondents, and others. They indicate clearly that careful planning, detailed preparation and counseling, and purposeful activity can do much to enhance the impact of our travelers on the people of other countries, and vice versa. In this connection attention should be called to the growing body of valuable literature, produced by various specialists and organizations, which represents thoughtful study and evaluation of various exchange and travel projects.

Some Generalizations and Suggestions

What is now being done to make the travel of Americans more significant is encouraging. It also points the way to what can be done by other agencies or organizations as they become interested in this question.

In the first place, further encouragement should be given to trips to areas of the world which few Americans visit, to travel for longer periods of time, and to more extended stays in particular countries and localities. Much can be accomplished through special travel arrangements at reduced rates and the financing of projects by individuals, service clubs, and other organizations. Recent trips to the Middle East by student groups offer stimulating and instructive examples.

At the same time, every effort should be made to develop greater and more widespread awareness of the responsibilities of American travelers. Much of our irresponsibility as travelers has stemmed from our tourists' "emancipation" from the sanctions that restrain their conduct at home. An awareness of the role of America in what President Eisenhower has described as "not a moment but an age of crisis" should restrain their conduct abroad.

In pursuit of such an awareness, prospective travelers should realize the value of a knowledge of a country, its language, and its people. They should have some idea of its relations with the United States. They should cultivate respect for the people of host countries, an awareness of their special problems, a desire to share common interests and to understand significant differences. In their conduct, they should strive truly to represent our people—and at our best.

The businessman will find that such an approach is good business. The educator and student should find it indispensable. The tourist should find that, far from detracting from his trip, it enriches it. In fact, such attitudes can best be built around

their major interests—be they business, education, or tourism.

For many, a trip abroad is a unique experience; they should be receptive to reasonable plans and suggestions. As Fred M. Hechinger, education editor of the New York *Herald Tribune*, has pointed out:

It has been my experience that the way to have the best possible time on a foreign trip is to have some sort of real objective. . . . The point is that such interests will give you a frame of reference which the ordinary tourist lacks. It does not limit and certainly does not exclude all other activities of the traveler. On the contrary, it may intensify them. It certainly will make their pursuit more intelligent. It will, above all, enable you to deal with people on a more meaningful level.

An increase in organized, sponsored travel should be encouraged insofar as the projects are worthwhile and send abroad people whose trips will make a desirable impact in other countries and at home.

Responsible sponsors and leaders of organized travel projects should be alert to profit from the growing body of experience of numerous organizations already in this field. Specifically, they should keep in mind the value of projects which make effective contact with people in the host countries, which are useful or gratifying to them, or which underscore common interests and goals. They should work closely and intelligently with affiliated or counterpart organizations in host countries and enlist their full cooperation. They should plan projects carefully and realistically. They should screen prospective participants carefully and prepare and assist them in every way to assure the success of the project. Where they select or finance participants, they should give due consideration to types of people who can contribute not only to the specific purposes of the particular project but also to the broader goals of cooperation and understanding.

One attempt to do so is that of the U. S. National Commission for UNESCO, which at a regional conference last September at the University of Minnesota included "The American as Tourist and Host" as one of its principal topics. The Commission is pursuing this matter further and hopes to include the same topic in the series of Citizen Consultation Conferences which it will sponsor in various parts of the country during the current year. Such conferences could stimulate broader interest in this problem and prompt other civic organizations to discuss it.

These are sizeable objectives. To attain them, all classes and types of travelers should be reached. The most effective channels are those near at hand—the mass media, authorized publishers, travel agencies, transportation companies, and automobile clubs, the organizers of various types of group travel, and the sponsors of interchange programs. New channels should be developed and additional organizations and agencies should be persuaded to participate. The stimulation of

widespread interest should result in more publications, more travel plans, more projects, and more sponsors.

Mass media, the travel agencies, and the transportation companies are especially important channels of influence on individual travelers. Within the natural limitations of what they can do, they would doubtless welcome suggestions as to what more can be done. The same thing is no doubt true of publishers and authors of travel books and guides and the travel editors of newspapers and magazines. Many techniques developed by the sponsors of organized travel might be considered for their applicability to individual travelers. In fact, the mere exchange of information and experience among all interested agencies and organizations would undoubtedly pay dividends.

Needless to say, all who are interested in this problem should keep in mind that effective understanding of other peoples is not necessarily best attained by head-on attack. On the contrary, it is more often a byproduct of other, more specific activity. Nor is a true picture of this country—its aims and motives—best achieved by mere talk; conduct counts for far more. They should also season their plans, activities, and aims with some such thoughts as Dr. Samuel Johnson's. "The use of travel," he said, "is to regulate the imagination with reality and, instead of thinking of how things may be, to see them as they are."

• *Mr. Colligan, author of the above article, is Deputy Director of the International Educational Exchange Service.*

Conversations in London and Paris Concerning Indochina

Statement by Secretary Dulles¹

White House press release dated April 19

I have reported to President Eisenhower on my recent trip to London and Paris, where I discussed the position in Indochina.

I found in both Capitals recognition that the armed Communist threat endangered vital free world interest and made it appropriate that the free nations most immediately concerned should explore the possibility of establishing a collective defense. This same recognition had already been expressed by other nations of the Southeast Asian area.

The Communists in Viet-Nam, spurred on by Red China, have acted on the assumption that a quick, easy victory at Dien-Bien-Phu would open the door to a rapid Communist advance to domination of the entire Southeast Asian area. They concluded they were justified in recklessly squandering the lives of their subjects to conquer this

strongpoint so as to confront the Geneva Conference with what could be portrayed as both a military and political victory for communism.

The gallant defenders of Dien-Bien-Phu have done their part to assure a frustration of the Communist strategy. They have taken a toll such that, from a military standpoint, the attackers already lost more than they could win. From a political standpoint, the defenders of Dien-Bien-Phu have dramatized the struggle for freedom so that the free world sees more clearly than ever before the issues that are at stake and once again is drawing closer together in unity of purpose.

The Communist rulers are learning again that the will of the free is not broken by violence or intimidation.

The brutal Soviet conquest of Czechoslovakia did not disintegrate the will of the West. It led to the formation of the North Atlantic Treaty alliance.

The violent conquest of the China mainland followed by the Korean aggression did not paralyze the will of the free nations. It led to a series of Pacific mutual security pacts and to the creation under the North Atlantic Treaty of a powerful defensive force-in-being.

The violent battles now being waged in Viet-Nam and the armed aggressions against Laos and Cambodia are not creating any spirit of defeatism. On the contrary, they are rousing the free nations to measures which we hope will be sufficiently timely and vigorous to preserve these vital areas from Communist domination.

In this course lies the best hope of achieving at Geneva the restoration of peace with freedom and justice.

In addition to discussing with the President the situation in Indochina, I reported to him with reference to the Korean phase of the forthcoming Geneva Conference which opens on April 26.

At Berlin the Soviet Union agreed that "the establishment, by peaceful means, of a united and independent Korea would be an important factor in reducing international tension and in restoring peace in other parts of Asia."² To achieve that goal is the purpose of the conference which will be held between the representatives of the Soviet Union and of the Chinese and North Korean Communist regimes, and the representatives of 16 nations which participated, under the United Nations Command, in the defense of the Republic of Korea.

The United States, working in close consultation with the Republic of Korea and the representatives of the other allied nations, will adhere steadfastly to this purpose of establishing by peaceful means a united and independent Korea.

I also discussed with President Eisenhower the prospective meeting of the NATO ministerial council to be held in Paris on April 23. Since the military program for NATO has now been estab-

¹ Made at Augusta, Ga., on Apr. 19.

² BULLETIN of Mar. 1, 1954, p. 317.

lished on a stable and durable basis, this particular ministerial meeting will be confined to an exchange of views between the foreign ministers with reference to the worldwide political situation as affecting the NATO members.

In preparation for this meeting I reviewed with President Eisenhower the United States estimate of the world situation and the persistence in varying forms of the menace of Soviet communism which makes it imperative that there be collective measures to meet that menace.

The President expressed his great personal satisfaction that NATO, as it completes its fifth year, has already made a large contribution to peace and faces the future with a prospect of growing strength and unity.

I leave for Geneva confident that the Western Allies are closer than ever before to a unity of purpose with respect to world problems, not only of the West, but of the East.

Secretary Dulles Leaves for Paris and Geneva

Statement by the Secretary

Press release 207 dated April 20

I am leaving for Paris where there is a meeting of the NATO Council on Friday [April 23]. On Saturday I shall go on to Geneva for the conference on Korea and Indochina. This conference has been called pursuant to the Berlin agreement of the Foreign Ministers of the United States, France, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union.¹

It is important to bear in mind what this Geneva Conference is and what it is not.

The first stated subject of the conference is "the establishment, by peaceful means, of a united and independent Korea." Twenty nations have been invited to meet at Geneva to deal with this topic.²

The other subject to be discussed is the "problem of restoring peace in Indochina." So far there has been no determination of the interested states which will be invited for this phase of the conference.

That is what the Geneva Conference is. There are some things it is not. It is not a "Big Five" Conference. The Soviet Union tried to make it that, but gave way before the combined opposition of France, Great Britain, and the United States.

The conference is not to discuss international problems generally. This was sought by the Soviet Union. But that concept was rejected in the

face of the opposition of the three Western Powers.

The conference does not imply our diplomatic recognition of Communist China. On the contrary, the Berlin agreement expressly stipulated that neither the invitation to nor the holding of the conference should imply diplomatic recognition where it is not already accorded. This proviso on which the United States stood absolutely firm was accepted reluctantly by the Soviet Union during the closing minutes of the Berlin conference.

There is some evidence that the Soviet Union may attempt to make the Geneva Conference something other than what had been agreed upon at Berlin.

The United States believes that the foundation for any relaxation of international tensions is a scrupulous observance of international agreements. We shall expect the Berlin agreement to be complied with both by the Soviet Union, which was one of the parties to the agreement, and by the other Communist regimes which come to Geneva pursuant to an invitation to meet on the terms set out in that agreement.

The United States is going to this Geneva Conference determined to seek in good faith the establishment of a genuinely united and independent Korea. We also accept the view that, if Korea can be made united and independent by peaceful means, this will make it easier to restore in Indochina a peace which has been broken by Communist armed aggression. We shall strive to achieve that peace on honorable terms consistent with the independence of Viet-Nam, Laos, and Cambodia—States which are now threatened.

Ever since the Berlin agreement to seek peace in Indochina, the Communist forces have stepped up the intensity and scope of their aggression. They have expended their manpower in reckless assaults apparently designed to improve their bargaining position at Geneva. It is tragic that war should be used and the lives of so many tens of thousands should be sacrificed as an instrument of political policy.

This is not a good prelude to Geneva. Nevertheless, we shall not be discouraged nor shall we grow weary in our search for peace.

U. S. Delegation to Geneva Conference

U.S. Representative

John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State

Special Assistant

Roderic L. O'Connor

Coordinator

U. Alexis Johnson, Ambassador to Czechoslovakia

Special Advisers

Theodore Achilles, Deputy Chief of Mission, Paris

¹ BULLETIN of Mar. 1, 1954, p. 317.

² *Ibid.*, Mar. 8, 1954, p. 347.

Robert R. Bowie, Director, Policy Planning Staff
Vice Admiral Arthur C. Davis, United States Navy
Donald R. Heath, Ambassador to Kingdoms of Cambodia
and Laos, and State of Viet-Nam
Douglas MacArthur, II, Counselor
Carl W. McCardle, Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs
Herman Phleger, Legal Adviser
Walter S. Robertson, Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern
Affairs

Advisers

Phillip E. Barringer, Department of Defense
Philip W. Bonsal, Director, Office of Philippine and South-
east Asian Affairs
John Calhoun, American Embassy, Seoul
Lt. Col. John E. Dwan, II, United States Army
Col. Robert G. Ferguson, United States Army
William Gibson, American Embassy, Paris
John Hamilton, United States Information Agency
Louis Henkin, Office of United Nations Affairs
John Keppel, American Embassy, Moscow
James F. King, Department of Defense
Edwin W. Martin, Deputy Director, Office of Chinese
Affairs
Robert H. McBride, Officer in Charge, French-Iberian
Affairs
Charles C. Stelle, Policy Planning Staff
Charles A. Sullivan, Department of Defense
Ray L. Thurston, Deputy Director, Office of Eastern Euro-
pean Affairs
Lt. Col. John Vogt, United States Air Force
Kenneth T. Young, Director, Office of Northeast Asian
Affairs

Press Officer

Henry Suydam, Chief, News Division

Deputy Coordinator and Secretary of Delegation

Basil Capella

Meeting of NAC Ministers

TEXT OF COMMUNIQUE OF APRIL 23

At a ministerial meeting held in Paris today, five years after the treaty was signed, the North Atlantic Council reviewed the progress made by the organization, examined the present international situation, and exchanged views on problems of common interest. The meeting was attended by the Foreign Ministers of the member governments under the chairmanship of M. Bidault.

The Vice-Chairman and Secretary General, Lord Ismay, reported on the work of the organization. His survey emphasized the effective working relationship developing within the alliance, a relationship which goes beyond the formal obligations assumed by its members. The Foreign Ministers took this opportunity to reaffirm their association in the Atlantic alliance as fundamental to the policies of their respective governments.

Recalling the defensive and peaceful aims of the treaty, they expressed their resolve to maintain and develop the alliance not only as the firm basis for the collective defense of their peoples, but also as an enduring association for common action and cooperation between the member states in every field.

After discussing international developments since its last meeting, the council found no evidence that the ultimate aims of the Soviet Union had altered, and noted that the military strength of the Soviet Union and its satellites continues to increase. The council therefore once more agreed upon the need for continuing efforts, vigilance and unity.

The council—reaffirming its long-established position that the institution of the European Defense Community is in the essential interest of the alliance—welcomed the ratification of the EDC treaty by a number of the signatories since the last Ministerial Meeting, which brings closer the entry into force of the treaty. The council also expressed its gratification at the far-reaching steps taken by the Governments of the United Kingdom and United States towards cooperation with the European Defense Community,¹ thus ensuring their lasting and close association with the defense of the continent of Europe.

With regard to the recent declaration by the Soviet Government on the status of their zone of occupation in Germany,² the council noted with approval that member governments of the organization had no intention of recognizing the sovereignty of the so-called German Democratic Republic or of treating the German authorities there as a government. It decided that the permanent representatives should draw up a resolution on this subject.

The council, with a view to developing further the habit of political consultation in the council, adopted a resolution on that subject, the text of which has been published separately.³

The council paid tribute to the gallantry of the French Union forces fighting in Indochina. It expressed the hope that the Geneva Conference will have positive results.

¹ BULLETIN of Apr. 26, 1954, p. 619.

² For text of a Department statement on this declaration, see *ibid.*, Apr. 5, 1954, p. 511.

³ The resolution recommends "(A) that all member governments should bear constantly in mind the desirability of bringing to the attention of the Council information on international political developments whenever they are of concern to other members of the Council or to the Organization as a whole; and (B) that the Council in permanent session should from time to time consider what specific subject might be suitable for political consultation at one of its subsequent meetings when its members should be in a position to express the views of their governments on this subject."

U.S.
Sov
F
23
miss
miss
T
wish
U.S.
O
Sov
fore
in R
Zone
tion,
cal r
TH
Evg
Otd
istry
the S
the I
Sovi
of G
the I
pers
W
appl
In
Gove
Okol
tor
Kuko
Berli
ber.
cow
retur
On
Sovie
the n
to his
tenan
Kuko
13-14
ceede
On
Khok
fied
the S
of as
time
intent
repug
manit
Okolo
cials
ruary
25 Fe
taken

May

U.S. Protests Actions of Soviet Union in Germany

Following is the text of a protest sent on April 23 by Walter Dowling, Acting U. S. High Commissioner for Germany, to the Soviet High Commissioner, Vladimir Semenov:

The Acting United States High Commissioner wishes to advise the High Commissioner of the U.S.S.R. of the following facts.

On 20 February 1954 a citizen of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics presented himself before authorities of the United States of America in Frankfurt am Main, which is located in the Zone of Germany under United States jurisdiction, requesting protection and asylum as a political refugee.

The applicant identified himself as Nikolai Evgeniyevich Khokhlov, officer assigned to the 9th Otdel of the Second Chief Directorate of the Ministry of Internal Affairs (MVD), Government of the Soviet Union, and stated that he had come to the Federal Republic of Germany by order of the Soviet Government to carry out the assassination of Georgiy Sergeyevich Okolovich, a resident of the Federal Republic of Germany and a stateless person of Russian origin.

With respect to his mission of assassination the applicant gave the following details:

In the fall of 1953 he was chosen by the Soviet Government to carry out the assassination of Okolovich. He therefore flew to the Eastern Sector of Berlin, Germany, where he met Hans Kukowitsch and Kurt Weber, both residents of Berlin, whom he conducted to Moscow in November. Kukowitsch and Weber were trained in Moscow in the use of assassination weapons and were returned to Berlin on 18 December 1953.

On 14 January 1954 Khokhlov proceeded by Soviet military aircraft to Vienna, Austria, under the name of Josef Hofbauer, and there reported to his superior officer, Saul Lvovich Okun, Lieutenant Colonel of the MVD. Khokhlov met with Kukowitsch and Weber in Zurich, Switzerland, on 13-14 February, after which the three men proceeded to Frankfurt am Main by separate routes.

On 18 February 1954 shortly after 7:00 p. m. Khokhlov went to the house of Okolovich, identified himself, and stated that the Government of the Soviet Union had assigned him the mission of assassinating Okolovich, at some convenient time prior to 20 March 1954, but that he had no intention of carrying out these orders which were repugnant to his conscience and contrary to humanitarian principles. After discussions with Okolovich, Khokhlov surrendered himself to officials of the United States Government on 20 February 1954, requesting asylum and protection. On 25 February 1954, Kukowitsch and Weber were taken into custody by United States officials in

Frankfurt am Main, and confessed their complicity in the assassination attempt described herein.

In the possession of Kukowitsch and Weber were assassination weapons consisting of two automatic 7mm. noiseless pistols and two devices disguised as cigarette cases containing an electrically operated mechanism for the discharge of poisoned pellets.

Mr. Khokhlov has not only requested the asylum and protection of this Government, but has moreover besought on humanitarian grounds its good offices to make representations to the Government of the Soviet Union to permit and arrange the travel of his wife, Yelena Adamovna Khokhlova, together with their infant son, Alexander Nikolayevich Khokhlov, presently residing at Don 5, Kuartira 13, Krivonikolski Pereulok, Moscow, telephone number 3-91-95, to the Federal Republic of Germany to rejoin him.

The foregoing events, which were followed on 15 April 1954 by the brutal kidnapping in Berlin of Alexander Trushnovich, a prominent stateless person of Russian descent and an associate of Georgiy Sergeyevich Okolovich, indicate a deliberately outrageous and uncivilized course of conduct on the part of the Government of the Soviet Union against which the Acting U.S. High Commissioner protests in the most vigorous terms.

U.S. Loan to European Coal and Steel Community

TEXT OF COMMUNIQUE

Press release 210 dated April 23

Following is the text of a communique issued on April 23 by the Government of the United States and the High Authority of the European Coal and Steel Community:

The United States Government and the High Authority of the European Coal and Steel Community have completed arrangements for a loan of \$100 million by the United States to the High Authority, to be made available at this time for the purpose of assisting in modernizing and developing the natural resources of the Community.

This is the first time a loan has been extended to the European Community, as distinct from separate nations. It is a concrete expression of support by the United States Government to the European Coal and Steel Community in accordance with the policy of encouraging European unity as declared by President Eisenhower and the Congress.

For the future capital requirements of the Coal and Steel Community it is essential that capital both in the United States and abroad be encouraged to provide the investment funds necessary for the normal growth of Europe's basic industries.

May 3, 1954

The United States Government and the High Authority in continuing negotiations will together seek new means by which with the assistance of the Government the mobilization of private capital for such investments can be promoted.

The terms of the present loan have been incorporated in an agreement between the United States Government and the High Authority which has been signed on April 23. This agreement provides that the loan will bear interest at $3\frac{7}{8}$ percent and be repayable over a period of 25 years.

The proceeds will be used by the High Authority to make loans to enterprises within the Community in order to assist in developing facilities for the production of coal, coke and iron ore; providing additional housing for miners; and constructing and modernizing power stations at the pit heads to facilitate the economic use of low-grade coal. The loans will go to projects which are considered by the High Authority to be consistent with the operation of a common market within the Community, free from national barriers and private obstruction to competition.

The United States took the occasion of the negotiations to advise the High Authority that it is consulting with some of the member countries of the Community on the lifting of quota restrictions maintained by them on United States coal. Representatives of the High Authority assured the United States that the Community is committed to the maintenance of a high level of trade with the rest of the world for coal and steel and that the removal of such quota restrictions on imports of coal is not precluded by any provisions of the Community's treaty.

The occasion was also used to discuss the prospects of maintaining and increasing competition in the markets for coal and steel within the Community. It was recognized in the discussions that considerable progress has been made in this direction over the past year.

TEXT OF REMARKS MADE AT SIGNING CEREMONY

Press release 212 dated April 23

Walter B. Smith, Acting Secretary of State

This agreement we are signing today between the United States Government and the High Authority of the European Coal and Steel Community has historic significance. In its broad context this agreement affords concrete evidence of our profound interest in the movement toward European unity, which the President and the Congress have so consistently supported as an essential ingredient of our collective endeavors to attain lasting security and peace. In an economic sense the loan represents a sound business transaction which should be mutually beneficial to both parties.

It is our earnest hope that the European Coal and Steel Community will successfully achieve its objectives and thereby provide a solid foundation for further progress toward unity in free Europe.

Jean Monnet, President of the High Authority

Mr. Secretary :

The agreement which today you have signed on behalf of the United States Government with my colleagues and myself, who are acting on behalf of the European Coal and Steel Community, is an event the significance of which goes beyond even the importance of the loan itself. Indeed this is the first agreement—I will almost say treaty—signed between the Government of the United States and United Europe.

You know that the European Coal and Steel Community is not coal and steel only, but is indeed the beginning of the creation of Europe. In this beginning six countries of Europe: Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands, have joined in transferring part of their traditional sovereignty to common institutions. These institutions have authority over the coal and steel resources of the six countries, and the immediate responsibility to create a common market without barriers or discriminations and to establish the basis of a dynamic and expanding economy.

We are not limiting this great enterprise to the six countries alone; indeed any European country that will accept the principles, rules, and democratic institutions of the Community can join.

We have already, in the field of coal and steel, created the European common market of 160 million consumers. The ultimate object is to eliminate all the barriers that have existed between European countries for so many centuries and to do away with the oppositions that have been the cause of the past wars. We are striving finally to unite the people of Europe themselves.

The loan which your Government has granted to the Community reflects in its commercial terms the established credit of the High Authority and the determination of your Government to continue to support our efforts in building this strong and united Europe so essential to the preservation of peace.

In the name of my two colleagues, who will now sign the agreement with me, and of the High Authority, I wish to assure you and the Government of the United States, of our appreciation for the support which you are giving us in this great enterprise.

Heinz Potthoff, Member of the High Authority

[Translation]

We are very glad that we now have the opportunity to further our raw material industries by contributing to their investments. These negotiations are the first step which will certainly be

follow
than
tions
they

Enzo

[Trans

Mr. A

I a
sole
to gi
Euro

I wo
ough

Al

work

the C

muni

doub

the I

Unit

State

spira

its m

shall

signe

port

itself

I h

aspir

will

oppo

lowe

best

Regi
and

Press

Th

holde

the B

by th

U.S.

or ar

secur

will b

citize

in the

A

for t

those

regist

decre

Belgi

carrie

Th

valid

May

followed in a short time by other steps. I, too, thank American opposite numbers in the negotiations for the understanding and sympathy which they have shown us in every phase of the talks.

Enzo Giaccherio, Member of the High Authority

[Translation]

Mr. Secretary:

I am glad to be able to say a few words on this solemn occasion, not so much because it enables me to give an Italian voice to the expression of this European principle that we represent, but because I would like to formulate an idea that in my view ought to be put forward today.

All those Europeans who, as I do, believe in and work for the integration of the six countries of the Community and for extension of this Community to other European nations, have all undoubtedly drawn much of their conviction from the historical and political development of the United States. Today, we can say that the United States is not only at the root of our political inspiration (because modern federalist thought has its main source in Hamilton, Madison, and Marshall) but also that with the Agreement now just signed the United States has given material support to the achievement of European integration itself.

I hope that at the end of the road our common aspirations will not be disappointed and that it will be clear to all, even to those who today are opposing us, that European unity is, if I am allowed to paraphrase Abraham Lincoln, "the last, best hope of Europe."

Registration of Belgian and Congolese Securities

Press release 211 dated April 23

The Department draws the attention of U.S. holders of certain securities issued in Belgium or the Belgian Congo to the following notice drafted by the Belgian Government. The notice requires U.S. holders of such securities as were formerly or are now on deposit in Germany to register these securities by May 28, 1954, or else the securities will be invalidated. It is believed that American citizens and former Nazi persecutees, now resident in the United States, may be affected by the notice.

A Belgian law of November 10, 1953, provides for the registration of the Belgian securities in those countries, e. g. in Germany, in which the registration of these securities pursuant to the decree-law of October 6, 1944, concerning the Belgian and foreign securities has not yet been carried out.

The securities covered by the law can only be validated if it can be proved that they were sub-

sequent to May 10, 1940, and without interruption the property of

(1) Belgian nationals, nationals of allied or neutral countries, or

(2) nationals of former enemy countries who pursuant to the provisions of the law of July 14, 1951, concerning the sequestration and the liquidation of German rights, assets, and interests were granted removal of the sequestration.

In principle, the registration extends to all bearer securities regardless of designation which have been issued by public authorities in Belgium or in the Congo area by Belgian joint-stock companies, Belgian trustee associations, limited liability companies in the Congo area, and by the association "Comite National du Kivu."

However, bearer bonds which have been issued by Belgian public authorities or Belgian companies are considered foreign securities and are exempt from registration if they are denominated in foreign currency. Applications are to be handed to the Belgian Ministry of Finance, Service du Recensement des Titres, Brussels, Rue Belliars, at latest by May 28, 1954, and are to be submitted to the Belgian Embassy in Bonn, 10 Friedrich-Wilhelmstrasse, by May 15, 1954.

The following documents and data are to be filed together with the notification:

1. An application signed by the holder of the securities showing the name, Christian name, trade, nationality, and residence of the holder as well as of the custodian, if any, and quantity, exact designation, and number of the securities;

2. All documents which serve the purpose of proving that the above-mentioned securities were actually deposited within German territory on October 7, 1944;

3. All documents which furnish proof that these securities are actually the property of the named holder from a date prior to October 6, 1944.

If the holder acquired these securities only subsequent to May 9, 1940, he must produce the following documents:

(a) a list showing in chronological sequence the names of all those persons to whom these securities have belonged since the above-mentioned date;

(b) documents showing any changes of ownership; and

(c) the proof that the first mentioned holder of the securities actually was the owner on May 9, 1940.

The name, Christian name, trade, nationality, and residence of each of the owners shall also be specified on this list.

4. If the holder is a German national he shall furnish a certificate from the Belgian sequestration office to the effect that the sequestration covering his securities in Belgium and the Congo area has been lifted.

May 3, 1954

297040-54-3

All documents specified under items 2 to 4 shall carry the names of all persons participating in changes of ownership and show the numbers of the securities. The present owner, as well as any of the persons mentioned in item 3 (a), may also be requested to produce a certificate concerning his nationality.

Applications already filed need not be renewed. If the Belgian Ministry of Finance grants the request for a declaration of validation, this Ministry will fulfill the necessary formalities with the "Banque Nationale de Belgique" in the name of the holder of the securities. The holder of the securities will be furnished with a certificate allowing him to sell the securities or to use them for other approved transactions.

If the application for a declaration of validation has not been submitted to the Belgian Ministry of Finance prior to May 28, 1954, or if the application filed cannot be accepted, the securities will be invalidated and their value awarded to the Belgian State.

FOA Allots Funds to Greece and the Netherlands

The Foreign Operations Administration on April 7 announced new allotments of \$10 million for Greece and \$4 million for the Netherlands from mutual security program funds of the current fiscal year.

The new funds for Greece, in addition to \$1 million allotted last September and \$4 million in November, are made available to support the Greek defense effort. The \$10 million allotment will finance the procurement of agricultural commodities as well as chemicals, fuels, and other Greek dollar import requirements.

The allotment for the Netherlands, which will finance the procurement of surplus cottonseed oil in the United States, has been made under the provisions of section 550 of the Mutual Security Act of 1953. This section provides that between \$100 million and \$250 million of mutual security appropriations for the current fiscal year shall be used to finance surplus U.S. agricultural commodities to be sold to friendly countries for local currencies.

The equivalent of \$4 million in Netherlands guilders, derived from the sale of the cottonseed oil, will be used for degaussing the Dutch merchant

fleet. Degaussing is a process which neutralizes the magnetic properties of steel ships as a safeguard against magnetic mines.

FOA has now made available a total of \$206,650,000 under section 550 to finance such surplus commodity sales to the United Kingdom, Federal Republic of Germany, Norway, China (Formosa), Finland, Yugoslavia, Israel, Spain, Afghanistan, Japan, France, and the Netherlands.

Voluntary Agencies To Aid in Technical Cooperation Program

The Director of the Foreign Operations Administration, Harold E. Stassen, on April 8 announced plans for developing closer relationships with voluntary agencies in the technical cooperation programs of FOA. These agencies are private, nonprofit organizations of a philanthropic or religious nature.

This is the second step taken in recent months by FOA to increase the active participation by private nongovernmental groups in U.S. programs of cooperation with the free peoples in the less developed countries of the Far East, Near East, Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Earlier, Mr. Stassen announced that many of next year's projects would be carried out through the use of 1, 2, and 3 year contracts with American universities and land-grant colleges.

Mr. Stassen said:

In our world-wide reviews of the FOA programs, we have seen evidence of very beneficial results from programs emphasizing a "people-to-people" approach. Through closer relationships with the voluntary groups, the colleges and universities, we hope to draw on the wealth of experience and technical knowledge that these groups have gained in conducting their own programs of a similar nature—both in the United States and abroad.

Many of the voluntary agencies have pioneered in work with people of the underdeveloped lands and have gained their confidence and respect. We recognize the valuable contributions their experience can make toward achieving objectives which they share with FOA.

Under the new plan, private nonprofit organizations experienced in operations outside the United States will be invited to play a more active long-range role in the FOA technical cooperation programs. The new arrangements with the volunteer groups will be of both a contractual and non-contractual nature.

Observance of Pan American Day

Addresses by Henry F. Holland

Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs

THE AMERICAN STATES: THE HOUSE OF FREEDOM¹

It is a privilege, and a very great pleasure, to meet with you here in the House of the Americas on Pan American Day.

It is an impressive and moving experience for one who has so recently entered into the duties and responsibilities of my office to come to this historic council table around which the representatives of the 21 sovereign and independent republics of this hemisphere have gathered for so many years in an atmosphere of freedom and equality.

It is particularly gratifying to me to have this opportunity to participate in this ceremony with the distinguished members of the Council of the Organization of American States.

The opportunity accorded me last month at Caracas of working with some of you, and with so many other eminent statesmen of the sister Republics, in the day-to-day labor of the Tenth Inter-American Conference,² will remain with me as one of the most valuable experiences of my life. I should like to take this opportunity to express again the sincere appreciation of my Government for the magnificent manner in which the Government of Venezuela prepared for and conducted the Tenth Inter-American Conference, and for the cordial hospitality which was extended throughout the meeting.

Let me include most especially among those with whom it was an honor to work Dr. Alberto Lleras Camargo, Secretary General of the Organization of American States, whose resignation all of us deeply regret and whose successor, whoever he may be, will find his own work the easier and the more productive because of the soil that has been tilled by so able a husbandman. I am confident that this Council will wish to set about the extremely

difficult task of selecting a successor to Dr. Lleras with all the wisdom and deliberation that the decision demands.

A Pattern for International Fellowship

The environment of the Pan American Union, like the environment of the Inter-American Conference, is one of friendship and cooperation. The Organization of American States, this congress of our 21 Republics which is an example and a pattern for fellowship among nations, has a continuing responsibility to prove to the rest of the world the soundness of enlightened cooperation among nations. Abraham Lincoln expressed an important concept of our relationship when he said "I shall do nothing in malice, for what I deal with is too vast for malicious dealing."

In this House of the Americas, and on this Pan American Day, we can summon up, each one of us for all the rest, the gracious, traditional Hispanic phrase: "You are in your house." In this hemisphere we have learned the validity of that phrase, neighbor to neighbor, nation to nation. As individuals we have learned to feel at home anywhere in our America, with its vast roof over arching Rockies and Andes, Mississippi and Amazon, extending from Pacific to Atlantic and from Arctic North to Antarctic South. It is the home of freedom, the haven of peace, and within its mighty structure the 21 Republics of this hemisphere prove from experience that in cooperation is strength and security.

It is no exaggeration to say that the active, effective cooperation of the American Republics during more than a half century has blazed a trail through the wilderness of international suspicion and conflict. Antedating the United Nations, and in considerable measure affording the lessons of experience for its workings, the Organization of American States is one of the regional groupings through which the U.N. Charter is strengthened and made more effective. Similarly, the Rio Treaty, a forerunner of the North Atlantic Treaty and other regional pacts, has helped cement collective security.

¹ Made at the Extraordinary Meeting of the Council of the Organization of American States, at the Pan American Union, on Apr. 14 (press release 195 dated Apr. 13).

² For a report on the Conference, see BULLETIN of Apr. 26, 1954, p. 634.

In spite of the dark clouds which remain so ominously on the world horizon, I do not falter in my conviction that the world is moving toward greater security through collective effort and ever-extending respect for the essential dignity of man. I am, however, aware, as I know each one of you is aware, that hemisphere solidarity is one of the surest barriers to prevent the aggressors' encroachments on human freedom.

Moves by Enemies of Freedom

While the Americas stand staunch in their interdependence, the hordes of hatred and violence will be deterred, and overcome. But let us not forget that eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty. Precisely because our mutual strength is great, our solidarity powerful, we are severally and collectively undergoing the test of our strength. Where would the enemies of freedom find greater advantage in striking—continually, secretly and with venom—than against the house of freedom? We know that by infiltration, by overt and covert propaganda, by attempts to sow dissension and distrust, forces from outside the hemisphere are continually making it necessary for the American Republics to affirm their interdependence and their confidence one in another. It is for this reason that I am so thoroughly convinced of the importance of the foreign policy declaration made at Caracas against the efforts of the international Communist movement to dominate or control the political institutions of an American State—against its intervention in our internal affairs.

It may be that it is too early to try to assess in realistic terms all of the accomplishments of the Tenth Inter-American Conference. So far as this Council is concerned, however, it is quite clear that the Conference has given it an emphatic vote of confidence. It has fully recognized the important work which the Council can carry out through careful and detailed consideration of problems of major importance, especially in the preparation of treaties and other instruments in the form in which they can be presented to the governments for final approval. Resolution 46 of the Final Act of the Conference entrusts to the Council certain types of activity which, if this resolution is adequately implemented, will afford the Council an opportunity to exercise that influence upon the functioning of the Oas which the representatives of our Governments gathered here should at all times be in a position to exercise.

Furthermore, several resolutions assign to the Council specific work in the preparation of drafts or revisions of such instruments as the Protocol on Duties and Rights of States in the Event of Civil Strife, and the Statutes of the Inter-American Peace Committee. To the Council has also been assigned the solution of problems related to the need for revision of the Pact of Bogotá and to a possible statute of an Inter-American Court of

Justice. In its normal executive functions, of course, the Council must also review and establish priorities, within the resources which are or may become available, for the carrying out by the Pan American Union and other organs of the Oas of the numerous projects or programs which were held to be suitable or desirable in one or another of the resolutions approved at the Conference.

In the economic field, the work of the IA-ECOSOC in preparation for the important meeting in Rio de Janeiro is perhaps even more pressing and urgent. The Tenth Conference took special pains to reemphasize the importance of the economic responsibilities of the system and to suggest measures for the strengthening of that body. The Inter-American Economic and Social Council, which contributed so signally to the success of the Fourth Meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs in Washington in 1951, in connection with emergency measures arising out of the Korean crisis, has been entrusted, as you know, with the difficult and highly important task of preparing for the Meeting of Ministers of Finance or Economy, to be held in Rio de Janeiro later this year. This, to my mind, demonstrates the esteem in which the Council is held. It is truly a forum in which all of our countries can discuss their economic problems, and it is my hope that, as a result of its work in coming months, a wide area of agreement will be worked out even before the Ministers assemble in Brazil.

My own experience and knowledge of the workings of this regional organization of the American States has been very brief—if somewhat intensive. However short, it has been most impressive. This process of education has confirmed for me concepts about the relationships among the independent nations of this hemisphere which I have developed in a number of years of active work which carried me at one time or another to many of the countries you represent. I hope before many months to have visited or revisited all of your countries.

The concepts and principles which give meaning to our inter-American relationship are all embodied in the charter of the Organization. What these things mean in practice, however, is that the representatives of 21 governments, countries which are divergent in many significant respects, can and do meet together, whether in an inter-American conference or here in this Council Chamber, with mutual respect stemming from equality before the law; with a willingness to listen to differing or completely opposing points of view; with confidence that aggression among the members of the community is a thing of the past; and without fear that the more powerful will interfere in the sovereign affairs of the smallest. The relationship which has been built among the nations of this hemisphere is unique in the history of the world. Let us preserve it and hope that, by example, it will continue to illustrate to the rest of the world the validity of Bolívar's pro-

phetic declaration, which can never lose its immediacy or its veracity, that in the freedom of the Americas is the hope of the world.

HIGHLIGHTS OF LATIN AMERICAN ARCHEOLOGY¹

Every year at this period, throughout the American Republics, inter-American solidarity is celebrated, and our 21 Republics call to mind the fundamental likenesses underlying our differences. Certainly it is salutary for us all to keep fresh in mind the great relationships of origin, tradition, and history that linked us in the eras of discovery, colonization, and independence; the obligations and rewards of voluntary association which we share today; and the unlimited promise of our mutual future.

However, in recalling and commemorating these aspects of our inter-American relationships, we usually, and naturally, dwell most on the inspiring story of how our 21 Republics achieved their independence and their present status as nations, against the common background of a European past, prevailingly Spanish, English, Portuguese, or French. We often forget that other great heritage, the pre-Colombian cultures, has also had great cultural influence on all our nations.

Latin American archeology as high-lighted in these exhibits will help set the record straight. I am informed that 2 million and more persons visit the Smithsonian every year. That vast number henceforward has the way made easy for observing and appreciating our pre-Colombian heritage.

I am happy that an institution so well known in Latin America as the Smithsonian has undertaken this fine work. In many countries of the hemisphere scientists of the Smithsonian have worked in close cooperation with colleagues in their host country.

Civilization of Pre-Colombian Man

Whatever gaps in knowledge may still exist, and there are many, one thing about pre-Colombian man in America is proved beyond all doubt. People who were living in America in 1492 and had been living here for thousands of years possessed complex, highly developed civilizations of their own. Proofs of that fact surround us here today. As we view this astonishing, this truly magnificent cumulative record of such rich and various cultures, we can comprehend the amaze-

ment with which 15th century Europe reacted to a New World thronged with wonders.

At whatever point the European firstcomers touched the Indies—our Americas—discovery of countless things new and strange awaited them whether in Peru, Mexico, or Guatemala.

In fact, I find one of the most interesting aspects about this exhibition is that it covers every country in the hemisphere and yet no part of it is confined to any one country. The point here is obvious: The cultures of people do not recognize artificial boundaries and it is right that this should be so. Nations may be justly proud of their contributions to civilization but they will not try to keep those contributions from reaching other people.

This exhibition in its own right is a valuable expression of the results of many years of patient and painstaking work in exploration and reconstruction of the origins of our people. It is even more a symbol of the determination of the people of the United States to know its neighbors better.

Following his visit to the South American countries last year, Dr. Eisenhower pointed out that one of our most important tasks was to create better understanding among the people of the American Republics. As he noted in his Report to the President:⁴ "Abiding cooperation among nations toward common goals must be based on genuine understanding and mutual respect." We might well resolve all the political problems that plague the young, burgeoning nations of this hemisphere, but there would still be no firm foundation for living in our community of nations if our people did not understand one another. We must know each other's past, our present ways of life and our aspirations, national and international.

Need for Cultural Understanding

It was for this reason that my government attached great importance to improving the Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations at the Tenth Inter-American Conference which recently ended at Caracas. It was for these reasons that we presented to the Conference a number of resolutions designed to increase cultural interchange among us. We lent our full support to every resolution that appeared to hold out the hope of furthering interchange of knowledge and skills among us. We shall continue to do all in our power to stimulate ways to bring about mutual appreciation of our nations and people, wherever possible increasing our cultural relations program with the other American Republics.

Recently in a message to the sponsors of the Town Hall series of lectures on Mexico now in progress in New York, President Eisenhower

¹ Remarks made at the inauguration of the "Highlights of Latin American Archeology" at the United States National Museum, the Smithsonian Institution, on Apr. 14 (press release 196 dated Apr. 13).

⁴ BULLETIN of Nov. 23, 1953, p. 695.

noted the many ways in which friendship between the United States and that country were evident. He dwelt at some length on how cultural and commercial interchange was being fostered between the two countries, and then observed that: "Yet a great deal remains to be done." There can be no question about this: Much has been done, but much remains to be done.

The President made a further observation wholly applicable to the lesson we learn here to the effect that the cultures of people can have no boundaries. He noted that the people of the United States have much they can learn by studying Mexican progress, and that the Mexican people would undoubtedly learn some things from observing material and spiritual progress in the United States which they might find useful in their own development. The same can be said of all the American Republics. Progress among peoples in history has always come about through the adoption of national developments and developments in other nations which are suited and can be adapted to the needs of another people.

The people of the Americas will find in this exhibition the symbol of the way to understanding of the past and present and the way to the future which is theirs.

U.S. and Mexico Discuss Broadcasting Problems

Press release 179 dated April 5

Representatives of the United States and Mexico met at Washington, D.C., March 29-April 2, 1954, for discussions on standard band broadcasting problems.

It was not possible to conclude an interim agreement at this meeting as contemplated. However, it was agreed to convene another meeting at Mexico City in October 1954 for the purpose of negotiating an overall agreement between the two countries on standard band broadcasting (535-1605 kc).

Conciliation of Boundary Dispute Between Peru and Ecuador

Press release 203 dated April 19

The United States, as one of the guarantor states of the Protocol of Peace, Friendship and Boundaries of January 29, 1942, between Ecuador and Peru, is releasing the following communique in accordance with recommendations received from the Committee of Representatives of the guarantor states which sits in Rio de Janeiro. The communique is also being released at Rio de Janeiro, Santiago, and Buenos Aires, capitals of other

guarantor states, and at Quito and Lima, capitals of the two principals which subscribed to the aforementioned protocol:

"In consideration of the proposals presented by the representatives of the guarantor states of the Protocol of Peace, Friendship and Boundaries of January 29, 1942 between Ecuador and Peru, animated by the desire to reestablish the atmosphere of harmony and confidence which should prevail among all the countries of the American continent, decided to return, in the presence of the military attachés of the guarantor states, in the locality of Huaquillas, the detained Peruvians and Ecuadoran who were being held in their respective territories, thereby bringing to a close the regrettable difference which was threatening to perturb the friendly relations between the two countries.

"This exchange was carried out at 3 p. m. on April 18, 1954."

Formal Claim Filed Against Guatemalan Government

Press release 206 dated April 20

The Department of State on April 20 presented to the Government of Guatemala, through its Chargé d'Affaires in Washington, Alfredo Chocano, a formal claim against the Guatemalan Government for \$15,854,849.

The claim had been filed with the Department by the Compania Agricola de Guatemala, a wholly owned subsidiary of the United Fruit Company, in connection with the expropriation in March 1953 of approximately 234,000 acres of land owned by the company on or near the Pacific coast of Guatemala. The expropriation has been the subject of several exchanges of communications between the two Governments.¹

The Department of State, in its memorandum transmitting the claim to the Government of Guatemala, referred to earlier communications in which the U.S. Government had raised the question of just compensation for the properties taken and had proposed settlement either through direct negotiation with the company or with this Government, or by referral to an international tribunal. The memorandum stated that since the U.S. Government had thus far received no indication from the Government of Guatemala that it favored treating with the matter in its present stage either through direct negotiations or by referral to an international tribunal, the U.S. Government considered it timely and warranted to submit formally the claim on behalf of the Compania Agricola de Guatemala against the Guatemalan Government.

The principal items in the company's claim are for the value of lands and betterments expropri-

¹ For text of a U. S. aide-memoire of Aug. 28, 1953, see BULLETIN of Sept. 14, 1953, p. 357.

ated in the Tiquisate area (\$6,984,223) and for resulting damage to the value of properties not expropriated, or severance damages (\$8,737,600). The claim sets forth that the Government of Guatemala by a resolution of March 5, 1953, ordered the expropriation of 233,973 acres of the company's land near Tiquisate, in the west coast region of Guatemala, of which 26,584 acres were described in the expropriation order as excess or untitled lands.

The company states in its claim that beginning in 1928 it purchased a total of over 302,000 acres in the west coast region of Guatemala for \$3,130,634.55; and that it had made a total investment in facilities and betterments on its west coast properties between 1936 and December 31, 1952, of \$25,942,026.58.

The company states that due to the presence of the Panama Disease and other factors, and the consequent need for reserve banana lands, the expropriation of lands carried out in March 1953 drastically shortened the life of the entire enterprise including that of the betterments, and gave rise to the claim for damage to the value of properties not expropriated (severance damages), in addition to the claim for the value of the lands and betterments actually expropriated.

The present claim has no reference to the expropriation of 172,532 acres of land belonging to the United Fruit Company near Bananera on the Caribbean slope of Guatemala, which was announced on February 24, 1954.

Current U.N. Documents:

A Selected Bibliography¹

Economic and Social Council

United Nations Conference on Customs Formalities for the Temporary Importation of Private Road Motor Vehicles and for Tourism: Provisions of the Draft International Customs Convention on Touring, Prepared by the Economic Commission for Europe and Relevant to Customs Formalities for Tourism (i.e. the Personal Effects of Tourists Travelling by Any Means of Transport). Note by the Secretary-General. E/Conf.16/5, March 30, 1954. 6 pp. mimeo.

Review of International Commodity Problems, 1953. Note by the Secretary-General. E/2515, April 2, 1954. 24 pp. mimeo.

Slavery. (Supplementary report submitted by the Secretary-General.) E/2548/Add.1, March 15, 1954. 3 pp. mimeo.

¹ Printed materials may be secured in the United States from the International Documents Service, Columbia University Press, 2960 Broadway, New York 27, N. Y. Other materials (mimeographed or processed documents) may be consulted at certain designated libraries in the United States.

Summary Financial Report of the Executive Chairman of the Technical Assistance Board to the Technical Assistance Committee on Technical Assistance Activities During 1953. E/TAC/39, March 18, 1954. 7 pp. mimeo.

Transport and Communications: Protocol on a Uniform System of Road Signs and Signals. Supplementary Note by the Secretary-General. E/2523/Add.1, March 22, 1954. 18 pp. mimeo.

Slavery: Consultations Concerning the Desirability of a Supplementary Convention on Slavery and Its Possible Contents. E/2540/Add.2, March 24, 1954. 3 pp. mimeo.

Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance. Report of the Technical Assistance Committee. E/2558, March 25, 1954. 20 pp. mimeo.

Commission on the Status of Women: Report of the Inter-American Commission of Women, Presented to the Eighth Session of the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women. E/CN.6/249, March 25, 1954. 28 pp. mimeo.

Forced Labour: Reports of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Forced Labour. Communication dated 1 March 1954 from the Permanent Delegation of the Polish People's Republic to the Secretary-General. E/2431/Add.7, March 26, 1954. 1 p. mimeo.

Forced Labour: Reports of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Forced Labour. Observations of Venezuela on a communication of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Forced Labour. E/2431/Add.8, March 29, 1954. 11 pp. mimeo.

Statement by the Secretary-General to the Economic and Social Council on 30 March 1954. E/L.578, March 30, 1954. 4 pp. mimeo.

United Nations Conference on Customs Formalities for the Temporary Importation of Private Road Motor Vehicles and for Tourism: Provisions of the Draft International Customs Convention on Touring, Prepared by the Economic Commission for Europe, Which Are Relevant to Customs Formalities for the Temporary Importation of Private Road Motor Vehicles. Note by the Secretary-General. E/Conf.16/4, March 30, 1954. 23 pp. mimeo.

Trusteeship Council

Conditions in the Trust Territory of Togoland Under French Administration. Summary of the observations made by individual members of the Council during the general discussion, and of the comments of the representative and special representative of the Administering Authority. T/L.439, March 16, 1954. 31 pp. mimeo.

Conditions in the Trust Territory of the Cameroons Under French Administration. Summary of the observations made by individual members of the Council during the general discussion, and of the comments of the representative and special representative of the Administering Authority. T/L.445, March 18, 1954. 42 pp. mimeo.

Conditions in the Trust Territory of Tanganyika. Working paper prepared by the Secretariat. Addendum. T/L.419/Add.1. 5 pp. mimeo.

Conditions in the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi. Working paper prepared by the Secretariat. T/L.420/Add.1, March 19, 1954. 5 pp. mimeo.

Conditions in the Trust Territory of Togoland Under British Administration. Summary of the observations made by individual members of the Council during the general discussion, and of the comments of the representative and special representative of the Administering Authority. T/L.450, March 19, 1954. 30 pp. mimeo.

Conditions in the Trust Territory of Tanganyika. Report of the Drafting Committee. T/L.451, March 19, 1954. 15 pp. mimeo.

International Organizations and Conferences

Calendar of Meetings¹

Adjourned during April 1954

| | | |
|---|------------------------|-----------------|
| ICAO Council: 21st Session. | Montreal. | Feb. 2-Apr. 7 |
| U.N. Human Rights Commission: 10th Session. | New York. | Feb. 22-Apr. 16 |
| ICAO Communications Division: 5th Session. | Montreal. | Mar. 9-Apr. 9 |
| UNESCO Executive Board: 37th Session. | Paris. | Mar. 10-Apr. 9 |
| Panama International Commercial Exposition. | Colon. | Mar. 20-Apr. 4 |
| U.N. Commission on Status of Women: 8th Session. | New York. | Mar. 22-Apr. 9 |
| 7th International Film Festival. | Cannes. | Mar. 25-Apr. 9 |
| FAO Technical Meeting on Forest Grazing. | Rome. | Mar. 29-Apr. 5 |
| U.N. Economic and Social Council (Ecosoc): 17th Session. | New York. | Mar. 30-Apr. 23 |
| 2d Meeting of the Provisional Committee of the Pan American Highway Congress. | Washington. | Apr. 5-9 |
| U.N. Statistical Commission: 8th Session. | Geneva. | Apr. 5-24 |
| Caribbean Trade Promotion Conference. | Port of Spain. | Apr. 6-12 |
| Joint ILO/WHO Committee on the Hygiene of Seafarers: 2d Session. | Geneva. | Apr. 9-13 |
| 2d Congress of the International Commission on Irrigation and Drainage. | Algiers. | Apr. 12-17 |
| International Fair of Milan. | Milan. | Apr. 12-28 |
| ICEM Subcommittee on Draft Rules and Regulations. | Geneva. | Apr. 20-22 |
| 4th International Congress of Prehistoric and Protohistoric Sciences. | Madrid. | Apr. 21-27 |
| PASO Executive Committee: 22d Meeting. | Washington. | Apr. 22-30 |
| NATO Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council. | Paris. | Apr. 23 |
| ICEM Finance Subcommittee: 5th Session. | Geneva. | Apr. 23-24 |
| ICEM 7th Session of the Intergovernmental Committee. | Geneva. | Apr. 26-30 |
| International Tin Study Group: Meeting of Management Committee. | Brussels. | Apr. 26 (1 day) |

In session as of April 30, 1954

| | | |
|--|---------------------|----------|
| 3d International Exhibition of Drawings and Engravings. | Lugano. | Apr. 15- |
| U.N. ECE 2d East-West Trade Consultation. | Geneva. | Apr. 20- |
| ICAO Conference on Coordination of European Air Transport. | Strasbourg. | Apr. 21- |
| UNESCO Intergovernmental Conference on Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict. | The Hague. | Apr. 21- |
| Lyon International Fair. | Lyon. | Apr. 23- |
| Geneva Conference. | Geneva. | Apr. 26- |
| International Conference on Oil Pollution of the Sea and Coasts. | London. | Apr. 26- |

Scheduled May 1 - July 31, 1954

| | | |
|--|------------------------------------|---------|
| International Exhibition of Industry. | Tehran. | May 1- |
| International Rubber Study Group: 11th Meeting. | Colombo. | May 3- |
| UPU Meeting of the Executive and Liaison Committee. | Lucerne. | May 3- |
| U.N. ECAFE Inland Waterways Subcommittee: 2d Session. | Saigon. | May 3- |
| WHO Seventh Assembly. | Geneva. | May 4- |
| International Sugar Council: 2d Session. | London. | May 5- |
| American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood: Annual Meeting of Directing Council. | Montevideo. | May 10- |
| ILO Advisory Committee on Salaried Employees and Professional Workers: 3d Session. | Geneva. | May 10- |
| ICAO Special Middle East Regional Communications Meeting. | Island of Rhodes (Greece). | May 11- |
| U.N. Conference on Customs Formalities for Temporary Importation of Private Vehicles and for Tourism. | New York. | May 11- |

¹ Prepared in the Division of International Conferences Apr. 22, 1954. Asterisks indicate tentative dates and locations. Following is a list of abbreviations: ICAO, International Civil Aviation Organization; U. N., United Nations; UNESCO, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; FAO, Food and Agriculture Organization; Ecosoc, Economic and Social Council; ILO, International Labor Organization; WHO, World Health Organization; ICEN, Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration; PASO, Pan American Sanitary Organization; NATO, North Atlantic Treaty Organization; ECE, Economic Commission for Europe; UPU, Universal Postal Union; ECAFE, Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East; CIGRE, Conference Internationale Des Grands Reseaux Electriques; ITU, International Telecommunication Union; WMO, World Meteorological Organization; and Cerr, International Telegraph Consultative Committee (Comité consultatif internationale telegraphique).

Calendar of Meetings—Continued

Scheduled May 1–July 31, 1954—Continued

| | | |
|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Large Electric High Tension Systems (CIGRE), 15th International Conference on. | Paris | May 12– |
| International Fair of Navigation | Naples | May 15– |
| International North Pacific Fisheries Commission: Meeting of Committee on Biology and Research. | Tokyo | May 17– |
| FAO Mechanical Wood Technology: 3d Conference | Paris | May 17– |
| U.N. ECAFE Regional Conference on Water Resource Development. | Tokyo | May 17– |
| Caribbean Commission: 18th Meeting | Belize (British Honduras). . | May 19– |
| ILO Governing Body: 125th Session | Geneva | May 24– |
| ITU Administrative Council: 9th Session | Geneva | May 1– |
| WHO Executive Board: 14th Meeting | Geneva | May 27– |
| 11th International Ornithological Congress | Basel | May 29– |
| FAO Technical Advisory Committee on Desert Locust Control . . | Rome | May– |
| ICAO Assembly: 8th Session | Montreal | June 1– |
| 14th International Congress of Actuaries | Madrid | June 2– |
| ILO Annual Conference: 37th Session | Geneva | June 2– |
| U.N. Trusteeship Council: 14th Session | New York | June 2– |
| FAO Committee on Commodity Problems: 23d Session | Rome | June 3– |
| U.N. International Law Commission: 6th Session | Paris | June 3– |
| International Cotton Advisory Committee: 13th Plenary Meeting. | São Paulo | June 7– |
| UNESCO Intergovernmental Conference of Experts on Cultural Relations and Conventions. | Paris | June 8– |
| Fifth Inter-American Travel Congress | Panama City | June 10– |
| International Exposition in Bogotá | Bogotá | June 13– |
| International Commission for Northwest Atlantic Fisheries: 4th Annual Meeting. | Halifax | June 14– |
| International Meeting of Tonnage Measurement Experts | Paris | June 14– |
| U.N. ECE European Regional Conference of Statisticians | Geneva | June 14– |
| U.N. Permanent Central Opium Board & Narcotic Drugs Supervisory Body: 11th Joint Session. | Geneva | June 14– |
| ICAO Meteorology Division: 4th Session | Montreal | June 15– |
| WMO Aeronautical Meteorology Commission: 1st Session | Montreal | June 15– |
| Civil Aviation Meet (Centenary of São Paulo) | São Paulo | June 16– |
| International Wheat Council: 15th Session | London | June 16– |
| ILO Governing Body: 126th Session | Geneva | June 25– |
| UNESCO Seminar on Educational and Cultural Television Program Production. | London | June 27– |
| U.N. Ecosoc 18th Session of the Council | Geneva | June 29– |
| ITU International Telegraph Consultative Committee (CCTT): Study Group XI. | Geneva | June 30– |
| Art Biennale, XXVIIth (International Art Exhibition) | Venice | June–Oct. |
| International Exposition and Trade Fair | São Paulo | July 1– |
| 8th International Botanical Congress | Paris | July 2– |
| 17th International Conference on Public Education (jointly with UNESCO). | Geneva | July 5– |
| 8th General Assembly of the International Union of Pure and Applied Physics. | London | July 6– |
| 6th Pan American Highway Congress | Caracas | July 11– |
| 2d Radio Isotopes Conference | Oxford | July 19– |
| International Whaling Commission: 6th Meeting | Tokyo | July 19– |
| 3d General Assembly of the International Congress of Crystallography. | Paris | July 21– |
| 4th Inter-American Congress of Sanitary Engineering | São Paulo | July 25– |
| World Power Conference: Sectional Meeting | Rio de Janeiro | July 25– |
| 4th General Assembly of the International Union of Theoretical and Applied Mechanics. | Brussels | July 27– |
| International Union for the Protection of Nature: 4th General Assembly. | Copenhagen | July 28– |

The Quest for Truth Through Freedom of Information

Statements by Preston Hotchkis

U.S. Representative in the Economic and Social Council¹

IMPORTANCE OF A FREE PRESS TO POLITICAL LIBERTY

U.S./U.N. press release 1898 dated April 9

Three hundred and ten years ago, John Milton wrote the "Aeropagitica." In defending freedom of information in his native land, Milton said:

And though all the winds of doctrine were let loose to play upon the earth, so truth be in the field, we do injuriously by licensing and prohibiting to misdoubt her strength. Let her and falsehood grapple; who ever knew truth put to the worse, in a free and open encounter.

This guiding principle has worn well with time; it remains a bright lodestar for our discussion here.

For freedom of information is essential to political liberty—no other freedom is secure when men and women cannot freely convey their thoughts to one another. The very survival of democratic government depends upon the man in the street having access to all the information he needs to exercise sound judgment on public issues.

The achievement of this goal has never been easy. But the historic evolution of a free press has taught us two important lessons.

First, that the growth of free information media starts at the grassroots. People must value free expression highly; they must have a real appetite for it; and they must be willing to work hard for it. No one can superimpose a free press on a populace which doesn't want it; no one can forever deny it to a populace which wants it badly enough.

Second, that the major obstacles to such a grassroots growth come from unenlightened governments. The development of a free press is a story of hard-won triumphs over such repressive governmental measures as licensing, censorship, suppression of news and coercion of editors. Those who hold power are often tempted to restrain free criticism, if only because they believe that they are wiser than their critics. Governmental intervention is inevitably detrimental to freedom of information.

¹ Made in the Economic and Social Council on Apr. 9 and 13.

So, the lesson of history is that paternalism is incompatible with freedom of information. We must choose between the free approach, in which people strive for what they get, and a paternalistic one, in which everything is furnished by a collective agency. The Soviet system is a classic example of the latter, for the government provides all the material means for the expression of ideas—printing shops, paper, etc.—but only at the cost of determining the ideas and controlling the expression.

Those who defend freedom of information, and who caution their friends against treading the path which leads toward totalitarianism, need never feel bashful about speaking up. They are enlisted with Milton in the right cause.

Practical Problems Involved

In that spirit, Mr. President, I shall examine the practical problems before us. These problems are outlined in three reports—the outstanding "Report on Freedom of Information" prepared by the rapporteur, Mr. Salvador P. Lopez; and the two reports prepared by the Secretary-General in cooperation with the specialized agencies on the "Encouragement and Development of Independent Domestic Information Enterprises" and "Production and Distribution of Newsprint and Printing Paper." These reports should contribute greatly to our deliberations. Indeed, they project so many suggestions that our real problem is to establish priorities among available tasks.

The practical proposals made in these reports fall into three main problem areas: (1) government restrictions; (2) economic and technical barriers to the flow of information; and (3) professional standards and the rights and responsibilities of information media.

Government Restrictions. The most important step that could be taken toward greater freedom

² U.N. doc. E/2426 and Add. 1 and 2.

³ U.N. doc. E/2534.

⁴ U.N. doc. E/2543.

of information is the elimination of government restrictions. There is far too much use, sometimes arbitrary, of such restrictions as censorship, suppression and coercion of information media, and repressive regulations. A free press cannot breathe in a climate of oppression.

The most complete controls exist in the Soviet world, in keeping with its totalitarian nature. But there are many countries which do accept the principle of freedom of information and yet stifle it in practice, from time to time, through censorship and other suppressive measures. The extent of such practices—as pointed out in the memorandum of the International Press Institute and in the Associated Press surveys of censorship—should be priority subjects for further work on freedom of information.

At this point I want to say a few words about the criticism to which the Associated Press and the International Press Institute were subjected by several speakers last Friday. These two institutions were accused of falsely reporting on the existence of various forms of censorship in certain countries, and the rapporteur of the Council was upbraided for making use of their reports.

I ask, Mr. President, what other reports could the rapporteur have used to point up the existence of widespread censorship practices? Governments, particularly those which have frequent recourse to censorship, are not in the habit of advertising their use of these practices. Even in our own organization, the U.N. and in Unesco, governments have only too frequently preferred to indulge in pious generalities about the evils of censorship rather than to encourage or permit factual studies of concrete censorship practices in scores of countries which profess to believe in freedom of the press.

Mr. President, I submit that our rapporteur deserves high praise rather than criticism for having had the courage to direct the spotlight of public opinion on the existence of forms of censorship so frequent, so widespread, so all comprehensive as to be a most serious threat to freedom of information. And we owe a debt of gratitude also to the newsmen in the Associated Press and the International Press Institute who in their struggle for freedom of information dare to incur the disfavor of governments by publishing what Mr. Lopez himself calls "factual reports on conditions which can be undertaken effectively by the profession."

It seems to me that the time has come when the Council itself must take steps to encourage the elimination of unwarranted government restrictions of the free flow of news. Fact finding is a first step toward such elimination of restrictions. Rather than criticize the efforts of those who are trying to keep us informed about such restrictions we should support, as a matter of highest priority, the proposal of Mr. Lopez of two worldwide sur-

veys to be undertaken by the rapporteur next year. The first is a worldwide survey of current internal censorship practices together with recommendations, where practicable, for remedial action. The second is a similar survey regarding censorship of outgoing news dispatches. I am struck by the fact that these two proposals are omitted in the long list of resolutions submitted by the French delegation. I do hope that this omission is unintentional and that the Council will act on these proposals for worldwide surveys of censorship as two of the most constructive and realistic proposals of the Lopez report.

The United States, which proposed the appointment of a rapporteur at the 14th Session of the Council for an experimental period of 1 year, considers that Mr. Lopez' work has amply justified this function. Therefore, we think it would be useful to appoint a rapporteur for another year to carry out the most urgent tasks suggested in the report—including the two I have mentioned above. We would be happy to have Mr. Lopez continue to serve in this capacity.

Loosening the fetters of government restrictions will contribute to greater freedom of information. But tightening these fetters will have the opposite effect. And this is precisely what I fear will happen if we indulge in further attempts to frame generalized conventions on freedom of information. No matter how altruistic our intentions, experience shows that we would end up with texts which would be used by some governments as a pretext for sanctioning or further restricting freedom of information. The convention approach seems most unwise in light of the experience of the past few years on the Draft Convention on Freedom of Information, which might better be called Restrictions on Information. Under present world conditions, attempts to formulate international legal commitments are more likely to hinder rather than advance the cause of freedom of information. With our limited facilities and resources we should concentrate on the jobs we can do, instead of dissipating our efforts on jobs we cannot do.

Barriers to Freedom of Information

Mr. President, the second problem area—economic and technical barriers to the flow of information—offers real promise of useful work. Here we face such problems as the production and distribution of newsprint, press and telecommunications facilities, rates and priorities, tariff and trade practices, and, perhaps most important, lack of local information media.

It is hard for us, here in the Council, to have a real feeling about some of these problems. We have freedom to speak. We have responsible journalists covering our debates. We can step into the Delegates Lounge and read newspapers from all over the world, or can obtain the latest

world news by teletype or radio at any moment. But at least 28 nations do not have teletype news services of any kind or have them on such a restricted basis that news cannot even move between the main population centers. Fifty-four nations and territories do not even receive the services of a world news gathering agency. Millions of people see a newspaper or hear a radio broadcast only at the rarest of intervals. This is a fertile field for realistically conceived and administered technical assistance.

Both the Secretary-General and the rapporteur stress the significant possibilities of applying the concept of technical assistance to freedom of information. They stress the development of independent domestic information enterprises, and the training and exchange of personnel in the information media.

Some parts of such a program would be directly related to economic development, and accordingly would qualify with the Expanded Program of Technical Assistance. Other parts would be included in the regular programs of the United Nations and the specialized agencies.

The Secretary-General points out in his report on Independent Information Enterprises that the United Nations and the specialized agencies have already extended assistance relating to telecommunications, visual media, the manufacture of paper pulp, paper and newsprint, modernization of printing techniques, and training of printers. This demonstrates that the United Nations already has the capability and experience to deal with the technical problems involved.

The most promising new suggestion is that this technical assistance now be extended to include the development of independent domestic information enterprises. The most important word in this idea is "independent." We will not accomplish our goals if United Nations technical assistance were to result in politically or governmentally controlled and guided enterprises. Here again, the work must be done from the grassroots up—the real problem is to promote the development of local newspapers and radio stations which are capable of standing on their own feet and are independent of governmental controls.

We should also keep our eyes clearly on the most important task—that of getting information to the people at the local level. This means more local media. It is premature for us to extend our limited resources to include the development of news agencies, desirable as that may be. When there are enough newspapers or radio stations in any particular country or area, they themselves will create the demand for news agency services. The Secretary-General wisely recognizes this fact by pointing out:

The possibility of setting up an independent news agency depends entirely on its having a sufficient clientele to make its operations viable. It has been found that attempts to dispense with the sound financial backing provided by a sufficient number of clients belonging to the independent

information media field (i. e., by subsidies or other methods of financing from governmental or other sources) may tend to discredit the agency's services in the eyes of a number of its potential clients. Hence, it may be said that attempts to create a news agency can be encouraged only if there already exist within the country sufficient potential clients willing to subscribe to its services.

Another aspect of technical assistance which could be quite productive is the fellowship program. The Secretary-General has suggested an increase of fellowships to enable the staff of domestic information enterprises of underdeveloped countries to serve as trainees in countries with more highly developed information enterprises. The rapporteur has put forward virtually the same proposal. This seems a most useful program. The United States has been encouraging this type of exchange for some time—in fact, 351 leaders of foreign information media visited the United States as guests of the United States Government during 1952.

Certain other suggestions have been put forward for action by the specialized agencies or for measures which can be taken directly by governments to assist in overcoming technical barriers to the flow of knowledge and information. Many of these deserve the support of this Council, but I shall leave our detailed views on these questions for elaboration in the Social Committee.

Professional Standards and Rights and Responsibilities of Information Media

Mr. President, there are also possibilities for making progress in the area of professional standards and of the rights and responsibilities of information media. However, we must be particularly careful to avoid the use of standards and responsibilities as a mask to curb the free flow of information. At its last session, the General Assembly adopted a resolution requesting the Secretary-General to continue his consultations with information media as to whether they would be prepared to meet to discuss a code of ethics.⁵ The United States, and many other delegations, stressed at that time that journalists would respect only a code drawn up without governmental interference by representatives of the profession. I believe firmly we must continue to adhere to that principle.

The rapporteur has suggested the possibility of enlisting the cooperation of information media in the cause of promoting friendly relations among nations, with particular emphasis on disseminating wider professional knowledge of the work of the United Nations, foreign countries and international affairs. He has suggested that it might be accomplished through appropriate courses in schools of journalism, visits of journalists to foreign countries and to the United Nations, and interchange of news personnel. My delegation believes that this might be added to the survey of

⁵ U.N. doc. A/Resolution/156.

hods may of a that only oten-
which pro- an of der- ries ter- ally pro- ring 351 the gov-
ard eas- ents the of at I ons
bill-
for
nd- in- cu- and y of As- cre- with l be The ssed ty a nce leve ple. y of a in ong nat- c of ter- t be in to and be- of
etin

ensorship practices and protection of sources of information of news personnel as priority responsibilities for the rapporteur and the Council in the coming year. I would like to stress, however, that our job should be to create better understanding rather than to train pro-United Nations propagandists. Newsmen cannot be expected to propagandize for any cause, no matter how good it may be. Their job is to provide information.

There are also a number of general proposals to encourage better professional training of information personnel in the Secretary-General's recommendations. These include encouragement of the establishment of professional training courses in underdeveloped countries, the facilitation of entry into the developed countries of persons desiring to improve their professional qualifications, and the use of experts to assist in the training of professional workers in underdeveloped countries. These proposals offer similar possibilities for constructive action.

Mr. President, we can use our resources intelligently and imaginatively to stimulate the grassroots development of free information enterprises, to lift government restrictions against their growth, and to encourage responsible journalism. But we must approach these tasks realistically. The seed of a free press is present everywhere where people are free to think and to speak. We cannot create that seed, but we can help nurture its growth and guard against those who—out of ignorance or hostility—would stifle the development of one of man's most precious freedoms.

Kidnapping of American Journalists

This task requires unceasing vigilance. The forces of darkness have already enveloped 800 million captive people in the world behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. Their totalitarian tentacles have even reached out to enfold foreign correspondents, for these regimes are so pathologically suspicious and afraid of honest reporting that they equate the quest for news with espionage. No one can forget the case of William Oatis who spent more than two years in a Czech jail because he tried to cover the news. Fortunately, Mr. Oatis is now free and is pursuing his profession here at the United Nations—covering the meetings of this Council—where it is not a crime to ask a delegate questions.

And this was not an isolated case. On March 21, 1953, two other American journalists, Donald Dixon and Richard Applegate, were seized by a Chinese Communist gunboat while sailing in a yacht in international waters from Hong Kong to Macao. For more than a year these newspapermen have been held incommunicado in a Chinese Communist jail, while the authorities of that regime have ignored completely the repeated inquiries and protests from my government, and from relatives, friends, and colleagues of the un-

fortunate journalists and their traveling companions who were seized with them.

Indeed, the Chinese Communists have never deigned to reply to requests for information on this brutal kidnapping—this act of piracy on the high seas. Dixon and Applegate now find themselves imprisoned by the Chinese Communists like 30 other American citizens. The only crimes of these 32 appear to have been that they were American journalists, missionaries, or businessmen or students. All these Americans have been kept in Chinese Communist jails, some for 3 or more years, in complete ignorance of the charges on which they are held. They have been denied counsel, and they have even been refused basic personal needs. Many have been subjected to physical and mental tortures designed to extract false confessions of guilt. It is a tragic fact that some Americans previously jailed by the Chinese Communists are known to have died as a result of bestial treatment.

It is an evil thing when freedom of information is suppressed through censorship and repressive regulations. But when this freedom is destroyed by the physical snatching away and imprisoning of journalists, then it is a matter deserving of the greatest condemnation and forthright action.

Mr. President, through this Council I am appealing to world public opinion in an effort to prevail upon the Chinese Communist regime to release from its custody Donald Dixon, Richard Applegate, and the other Americans held in Chinese Communist jails or otherwise prevented from leaving Communist China. I am also serving notice that the United States will keep this issue alive in appropriate organs of the United Nations and wherever else it may prove helpful. This to the end that these victims of the foes of truth and freedom may be liberated and that Milton's words—"whoever knew truth put to the worse"—will once again be vindicated.

REFUTATION OF SOVIET STATEMENTS

U.S./U.N press release 1903 dated April 13

When I listened to the remarks of the Soviet delegate, it reminded me somewhat of the hero in Stephen Leacock's play who mounted his horse and rode furiously in all directions.

The Soviet delegate evidenced acute reaction against the criticism of the rapporteur's report, and the very violence of the reaction is the best indication to me that the criticism was well directed. In the United States we welcome criticism, especially honest, constructive criticism, as that is the way we all learn and progress in my country. That points up one major difference in the speeches of the delegates around this table on freedom of information over the last two days. There has been honest criticism against the dishonest criticism that we just heard; real difference

of opinion against propaganda; sincere opinion against pure demagoguery; dignified statement of position against an endless diatribe and perversion of the truth.

Now, what were some of those perversions of the truth. First, you heard the statement made by the Soviet delegate that you have to be a millionaire or a billionaire in the United States to own a newspaper. Well, I don't know what a billionaire is. I never saw one. That's too stratospheric in numbers for me. But I come from the little town of San Marino in California that has a population of 13,000 people. We have a newspaper there. It is owned by a resident of San Marino, completely independent, and we read the newspaper—most all the residents of San Marino read that newspaper. He is not a subsidiary of any large organization. He is the sole proprietor of his own business and he prints in the paper what he thinks are the best facts that he can get, not what he thinks the people would like to read, but the facts. It is a small business which is typical of thousands of small towns in my country, and it is typical and symbolical also of the way 95 percent of the business in my country is done—not by large companies but by small companies or small individual businesses.

The next statement was that the American press is a monopoly, a trust run by dollar grabbing capitalists. I would remind my Soviet colleague once more that we in the United States have no monopolies, except in public utilities that are strictly regulated by the state or by the federal government. We do not have monopolies. We have anti-trust laws which prevent monopolies, whereas in the Soviet Union they have only monopolies and the state owns everything, almost even the souls of the people. In the Soviet Union all information comes from government dictates.

Now, the next statement was that in the United States our citizens are spoon-fed news and information which a few Wall Street bankers want them to read. I am not going to dignify a statement of that kind with an answer. I would only say that the delegate from the Soviet Union can go right out in this building to the newsstand and for a few nickels he can purchase more different opinions from the newsstand in this very building than in the whole of Soviet Russia.

His next statement was that in the United States all news is dominated by only three wire services, the Associated Press, the United Press, and the International News Service. Well, what's wrong with those services? Do they print facts or do they print only propaganda dictated by a totalitarian regime? In Soviet Russia they have only one wire service, TASS. I believe the representa-

tive is here. And the representative of TASS is a government employee, a government agent, allowed into this country on a visa as a representative of the Soviet Union. And this agency parrots only what the Kremlin dictates.

The representative of Soviet Russia mentioned the evil events foretold by George Orwell in his book "1984." I would like to advise my distinguished colleague from the Soviet Union that before he quotes that book again he ought to read it, for that book is a biting satire on the black abyss into which the Soviet Union would like to lead all free countries.

The representative of Soviet Russia stated that some correspondents, foreign correspondents, were over in Russia. He either stated or implied they had freedom to travel around, freedom to send home the news they wanted. He mentioned Mr. Salisbury of the *New York Times*. During my lunch hour I had occasion to check with the *New York Times* and they inform me that Mr. Salisbury does not have full freedom to report, since everything that he writes goes through censorship, the censorship which Mr. Lopez referred to in his report. He does not have full freedom to travel since many parts of the Soviet Union are forbidden areas. If the delegate from the Soviet Union really believes in full freedom of information, I challenge Soviet Russia to lift its censorship on outgoing dispatches as the first step in this direction.

Now, Mr. Lopez was attacked in a most violent manner and it has reminded me and my colleagues of the equally vicious attack that the Soviet Union made in the General Assembly against Justice Berg of Norway and Sir Ramaswami Mudalier of India. It is obvious that they fear the information which these servants of the United Nations have given us. This is the measure of their belief in the subject that we are talking about.

Finally, the Soviet delegate came to his point and unmasked his objective. What did he say? He said abandon the freedom of information path which the Lopez report talks about and take a new road, the Soviet road, down the path to Russian communism, the blackness of the dark ages where men are chattels and where the government tells the people what to think and what to say.

Confirmation

The Senate on April 9 confirmed the nomination of George P. Baker to be U.S. representative on the Transport and Communications Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the U.N.

The Search for Means of Controlling Atomic Energy

Statements by Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.

*U.S. Representative to the United Nations*¹

Nature of Commission's Task

U.S./U.N. press release 1901 dated April 9

The Disarmament Commission resumes its work at a moment when the whole world is gripped with the knowledge that a new dimension has been added to the dangers of the atomic age.

Months before the recent tests at the Pacific proving grounds, the President of the United States spoke to us on December 8 here in the United Nations about the significance to the world of what he called these "fearful engines of atomic might."² He offered concrete proposals which expressed the conscience and the hope of America, and I believe of all of humanity. He called upon us to find a way out of the "dark chamber of horrors" into which the perversion of atomic development for warlike purpose seems to be leading us.

We are interested that the Soviet Union recognizes and declares the peril which threatens it as well as all of us in the free world. In its recent note delivered to the United States Government³ it states:

There cannot be any doubt that the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons in war would cause untold disaster to peoples, would mean mass annihilation of the world's population, destruction of large cities—the centers of present day industry, culture, and science, including the oldest centers of civilization which are the largest capitals of world states.

This is certainly true.

And now the Prime Minister of India has made a statement to his Parliament on atomic and hydrogen weapons which in accordance with his request has been distributed as a Disarmament Commission document.⁴ It is clearly entitled to respectful attention. We suggest that this document be referred to the subcommittee and be considered there.

We may assume, therefore, that on both sides of the line which now divides the world there is a recognition of mortal danger. We, on our side, hope that this increasing awareness on the Communist side will be accompanied by a determination matching our own to circumvent the danger and to unlock for mankind the incalculable good in atomic energy.

¹ Made in the Disarmament Commission on Apr. 9, 14, and 19.

² BULLETIN of Dec. 21, 1953, p. 847.

³ Delivered on Mar. 31; not printed here.

⁴ U.N. doc. DC/44.

Until we find a solution to this most pressing problem of our age, neither our world nor the Communist world can be free of the heavy burdens of the arms race nor of the shadow of atomic war.

An understanding depends upon good will and good faith, upon a flexibility of mind and a willingness to explore new methods, and above all an interest and a desire to get action and results. Sometimes these qualities have been lacking but in spite of many past disappointments we never give up hope.

Text of Resolution Adopted by Disarmament Commission on April 19¹

U.N. doc. DC/49

Dated April 19

The Disarmament Commission,

Noting General Assembly resolution 715 (VIII) and the resolution on disarmament agreed by the Four Foreign Ministers at Berlin on 18 February 1954,

1. *Decides*, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 715 (VIII), to establish a Sub-Committee consisting of representatives of Canada, France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America;
2. *Recommends* that the Sub-Committee should hold its first meeting on 23 April, and should arrange its own meetings and method of work;
3. *Recommends* that the Sub-Committee should present a report on the results of its work to the Disarmament Commission not later than 15 July.

¹ Introduced by the United Kingdom; adopted, as amended, by a vote of 9-1 (U.S.S.R.)-2 (Lebanon, China). The Soviet proposal was rejected by a vote of 1 (U.S.S.R.)-10-1 (Lebanon).

We in this country particularly approach this new round of talks with a deep sense of obligation. As pioneers and principal custodians of atomic energy, we have never ceased to encourage initiative to bring it under control. The plan offered to the U.N. as far back as 1946 constituted one such initiative; President Eisenhower's proposals of last December for an international pool of fissionable material for peaceful purposes is another. The Secretary of State of the United States is currently discussing the project with representatives of the Soviet Union.

We also welcome most earnestly any proposals for revising the method of dealing with disarmament which promises to make discussions more fruitful. For all these reasons, the United States Government stands ready to pursue the progressive suggestions made by the past session of the General Assembly for the establishment of a subcommittee of this commission to "seek in private an acceptable solution."² We are hopeful that such close and intimate consultation, untrammelled by publicity and unburdened of the weight

² BULLETIN of Dec. 14, 1953, p. 838.

of propaganda, may produce more results than the formal debates which we have previously held.

Such a subcommittee should of course consist of France, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States, and we believe it should also include Canada, which occupies a unique place, both for reasons technically connected with disarmament and also because of her gifts of international moral leadership.

Mr. President, this is not a time for oratory but for hard practical work. We may doubt whether this committee, no matter how hard and how sincerely it works, will be able within a short time to solve all the vast problems of control of atomic energy. We may well be content if we make some tangible progress. Let us be heartened by the thought that agreements on specific points can in turn lead to greater agreements and then to genuine positive accomplishments. Would that there were a simple formula which, even if it could not give us full security, would at least materially reduce the total danger which confronts the world today. However, there is no such simple formula. There is no magic wand which we can wave and bring the millennium overnight. There is nothing to substitute for hard painstaking work animated by a sincere desire to get results but not motivated by a race for the world's headlines.

In that hopeful spirit, Mr. President, let us begin.

Participation of Communist China

U.S./U.N. press release 1904 dated April 14

Let me make two brief observations concerning the proposal of the Soviet representative for participation of the Chinese Communists in the subcommittee.⁶

First, the Soviet proposal to include the Chinese Communist regime is both fallacious and unwise. What we are discussing here is the composition of a subsidiary body of this commission, a subcommittee, if you please, which in turn is a subsidiary body reporting to the General Assembly and to the Security Council. In the General Assembly and in the Security Council representatives of the Government of the Republic of China sit for China, and they are the only representatives who can legally represent China in the Disarmament Commission or any subsidiary bodies it may establish.

Secondly, the United States opposes the inclusion of Communist China in the subcommittee for substantially the same reasons which cause us to oppose representation of Communist China in the United Nations. And I need not take the time of this body this afternoon to give all those reasons because you are thoroughly familiar with them.

⁶ U.N. doc. DC/48 dated Apr. 14. The Soviet draft also proposed India and Czechoslovakia as participants.

The plain truth is that commonsense tells us that the nations which are included in the resolution of the United Kingdom⁷ are numerous enough and responsible enough and involved enough to reach an agreement on disarmament.

U.S. Views on Subcommittee

U.S./U.N. press release 1907 dated April 19

Sometimes I get the impression that the representative of the Soviet Union gets so carried away or fascinated by the rumble of his own voice that he says things which on sober reflection later he must regret. I am sure that he feels sorry now that he implied, for example, that India was a satellite because, of course, it is a well-known fact that India is an independent nation which stays in the British Commonwealth solely because it wants to stay in the British Commonwealth. His inference that Canada was a satellite of the United States, or that the United States was a satellite of Canada—I forget which way he had it—is, of course, equally absurd.

The Soviet representative seems to see satellites everywhere, probably because his Government has put so much time and energy into setting up a monolithic satellite edifice whose structure, I may add, is as brittle as its surface is hard. He cannot understand the fact of people in this world doing things because they believe in them. He cannot understand the basic essential strength of free peoples in which the rights and the views of everyone, be they small or large, weak or strong, are respected.

Now, Mr. President, for reasons which I have made clear many times, the United States is opposed to the inclusion of the Chinese Communist regime on the subcommittee. It is a regime which is manifestly unfit to take part in this work. If it is put to a vote, I shall vote against including them.

Similarly, the United States is opposed to the inclusion of Czechoslovakia and I shall vote against their inclusion. The whole world knows that Czechoslovakia has neither a voice nor a vote which it can call its own.

The Government of India in its communication of April 8 regarding the hydrogen bomb⁸ said, "The Government of India are fully aware that any effective consideration and solution of these problems can be reached only by the powers principally concerned." I stress the words "only by the powers principally concerned." The representative of the Soviet Union has produced no evidence to indicate that India wants to be in the subcommittee. There is every indication that the Government of India was not consulted on the Soviet proposal and does not, in fact, desire to

⁷ U.N. doc. DC/47 dated Apr. 12. This draft named the U. S., U. K., U. S. S. R., France, and Canada as members of the subcommittee.

⁸ U.N. doc. DC/44.

serve. If it is put to a vote, I shall abstain on the inclusion of India on the subcommittee.

Let me say, however, that the United States is very much in favor of hearing a full exposition of the views of the Government of India. We would, therefore, favor an invitation to India to send a representative to the subcommittee at an early date to express her views, and in fact the United States intends to propose such an invitation to the subcommittee at the proper time.

Mr. President, the Soviet representative argued that the subcommittee would be so lopsided that the Soviet Union would be outvoted. He is in error. There is no outvoting and there will be no outvoting in the subcommittee because there isn't going to be any voting. Nations will be bound only by their own vote. We believe that an "acceptable solution," which is what the General Assembly resolution calls for, means a solution acceptable to all members of the subcommittee, to the Soviet Union as well as to all other members. When the subcommittee is set up we expect to take the position that it should not vote at all, just as the Disarmament Commission never voted except on strictly procedural matters. So there is nothing to worry about there.

Mr. President, let us be candid with each other and with the public. The pending proposal of the United Kingdom is the world's best hope for disarmament. Those who favor disarmament will support it. Those who vote against it will inevitably be regarded as being opposed to disarmament. Now, those are hard words, but that is the hard fact. All else is propaganda, legalism, technicalities, and surplusage. A thinly veiled threat to walk out which is what the representative of the Soviet Union has made, is also a thinly veiled threat to torpedo the peace. The choice before us is simple. The stakes are immense. Let us act like men and hesitate no longer and thus we can lead the world to peace.

Armistice Agreement Violations

*Following is the text of a letter dated April 15 from Maj. Gen. J. K. Lacey, Senior U.S. Representative on the Military Armistice Commission in Korea, to the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission:*¹

1. For investigation of violations of the Armistice Agreement by the KPA/CPV [Korean People's Army/Chinese People's Volunteers] side, during the period 29 November 1953 to 9 February 1954, the following facts are presented for your immediate consideration.

¹ For information concerning the composition and functions of these commissions as described in the Korean Armistice Agreement, see BULLETIN of Aug. 3, 1953, pp. 134-137.

2. On 29 November 1953, after the KPA/CPV in a meeting of the MAC [Military Armistice Commission] refused to submit a joint letter to the NNSC [Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission], the UNC [United Nations Command] unilaterally requested the NNSC to investigate the case of three soldiers apprehended by the UNC on 19 November 1953 in the Joint Security Area. These three soldiers were identified beyond question to be former soldiers of the ROKA [Republic of Korea Army]. The place and date of their capture by the KPA/CPV was firmly established. Although ample evidence was available to verify the fact that these persons were impressed into the KPA/CPV military units, and were retained after 24 September 1953, a clear violation of paragraph 51 of the Armistice Agreement by the KPA/CPV, the Czech and Polish members of the NNSC refused to participate in any proceedings for the consideration of this critical matter as a violation of the Armistice Agreement.

3. On 18 December 1953, after the KPA/CPV in another meeting of the MAC again refused to submit a joint letter to the NNSC, the UNC unilaterally, and for the second time, requested the NNSC to investigate the case of two individuals apprehended by the UNC, South of the Southern boundary of the Demilitarized Zone on 10 December 1953. These individuals, as in the case of the three ROKA persons previously cited, were also identified beyond question to be former soldiers of the ROKA who had been impressed into the KPA/CPV military units. Their retention after 24 September 1953 constituted a second clear violation of paragraph 51 of the Armistice Agreement by the KPA/CPV. For the second time, the NNSC failed to take any action on a unilateral request from the Senior Member of a side as authorized in paragraphs 28 and 42F of the Armistice Agreement. For the second time, the Czech and Polish members of the NNSC refused to participate in the performance of their solemn obligation under the terms of the Armistice Agreement.

4. On 18 January 1954, and again on 26 January 1954, the UNC submitted separate unilateral requests to the NNSC to investigate specific military units of the several ROKA persons, who had been impressed into the military service of the KPA/CPV, in order to ascertain whether these and other individuals had also been forcibly detained in the territory under the military control of the KPA/CPV. For the third and fourth time, respectively, the Czech and Polish members of the NNSC again refused to cooperate in the investigation of KPA/CPV violations of the Armistice Agreement. The arguments presented by the members gave every indication of being mere excuses to prevent the NNSC from confirming KPA/CPV violations of the Armistice Agreement in the territory under the military control of the KPA and the CPV. Particularly significant, however, was the fact that the responses of the Polish and Czech

members as evidenced by an examination of the minutes of the 89th and 96th meetings of the NNSC, conformed to and appeared to be unduly influenced by the contents of two prior letters of 19 January and 27 January, issued by the Senior Member of the KPA and CPV, MAC, as his reply to the UNC unilateral requests submitted to the NNSC on 18 January and 26 January, respectively. Substantiation of such influence is found in the following remark made by the Polish member and confirmed by the Czech member, at the 96th meeting of the NNSC:

The Polish Delegation also deems it its duty to declare that for the above stated reasons it will not agree—either now or in the future—to a request of one of the sides to conduct any investigation in connection with the issue of retention of the captured personnel of the other side—until settlement or understanding is reached on the matter by the two opposing sides or by the forthcoming political conference.

Such a decision by the Czech and Polish members is considered by the UNC to render the NNSC ineffective for future investigation of any Armistice violations relating to captured ROKA personnel impressed into KPA and CPV military units.

5. Finally, on 9 February, 1954, the UNC unilaterally requested the NNSC to investigate the illegal introduction of combat material into the territory under the military control of the KPA and the CPV, in violation of the Armistice Agreement. Names of places and exact locations were included in this request of the UNC. Before the NNSC had officially announced its decision regarding the UNC request, the Senior Member of the KPA and CPV, MAC, addressed a letter to the Senior Member of the UNC, MAC, denying all the facts presented. Concurrently he forwarded an almost identical letter to the NNSC. The influence that this letter had on the proceedings of the NNSC cannot be discounted.

6. In attempting to veil these KPA and CPV violations, the Senior Member of the KPA and CPV, MAC, charged the UNC with violations of the Armistice Agreement, with no foundation in fact. In addition to labeling the UNC charges slanderous fabrication, the Senior Member of the KPA and CPV, MAC, attempted to offset the UNC requests for investigation of violations by submitting unfounded charges against the UNC. In a letter dated 23 Feb. 1954, the NNSC indicated its inability to carry out its pledged obligations with regard to the UNC requests of 9 February 1954. This letter was received on 19 March 1954. This was the fifth time that the Czech and Polish members of the NNSC refused to participate in the performance of their duties as members of the NNSC, in accordance with the provisions of the Armistice Agreement.

7. Reliable information available to the UNC shows that the KPA and CPV have introduced operating combat aircraft into the territory under

the military control of the KPA and the CPV, and are introducing combat equipment in such a manner as to by-pass and evade the NNITs [Neutral Nations Inspection Teams] at the ports of entry in the territory under the military control of the KPA and the CPV, all of which acts are deliberate violations of the Armistice Agreement. Although the Senior Member of the UNC, MAC, has requested that investigation of these violations be accomplished by the NNSC, the Senior Member of the KPA and CPV, MAC, has stated that no such inspection could ever be permitted since the KPA and CPV have not violated the agreement. The Senior Member of the KPA and CPV, MAC, as the representative of his commanders, has clearly violated that portion of para 17 of the Armistice Agreement which states:

The Commanders of the opposing sides shall establish within their respective commands all measures and procedures necessary to insure complete compliance with all of the provisions hereof by all elements of their commands. They shall actively cooperate with one another and with the Military Armistice Commission and the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission in requiring observance of both the letter and the spirit of all of the provisions of this Armistice Agreement.

8. The UNC has made every effort to facilitate the operations of the NNSC in the territory under the military control of the UNC and has in good faith complied with the letter and spirit of the Armistice Agreement. The NNITs have been given maximum freedom to inspect incoming and outgoing equipment according to the agreement. The NNITs have been given access to documents listing combat materiel and military personnel introduced into and evacuated from the territory under the military control of the UNC. With the aid of these documents they have been able to accomplish their supervisory duties quickly and efficiently. At airfields the teams received information on all arrivals and departures of aircraft including approximate flight appointment times, type of aircraft, and flight numbers. The teams have been allowed to board cargo aircraft to accomplish their inspections and inspections have been carried out daily. The UNC has always willingly and freely complied with requests of the NNITs for additional information. The UNC, in its desire to carry out both the spirit and letter of the Armistice Agreement, has allowed the above mentioned freedom to the NNITs in spite of the fact that it has been obvious from the first that the Polish and Czech members of the NNITs have been utilizing this very freedom for the purpose of taking advantage of administrative errors and technical discrepancies to charge the UNC with deliberate efforts to violate the Armistice Agreement. If the UNC had intended to violate the Armistice Agreement it would have followed the system used in the territory under the military control of the KPA and CPV. In that territory the NNITs have been so restricted and handicapped by the established procedures that they

have been unable to report or investigate any possible violations of the Armistice. Since the Czech and Polish members of the NNSC have subscribed to and supported the views of the Senior Member, KPA and CPV, MAC, before making proper investigations of violations to the Armistice Agreement, as requested by the Senior Member of the UNC, MAC, it appears clear that the NNSC has been paralyzed to such a degree that it cannot carry out its pledged obligations as outlined under the terms of the Armistice Agreement. The acceptance of the KPA and CPV views of the letters of 19 January, 27 January, and 12 February, respectively, by the members from Poland and Czechoslovakia, without consideration of the evidence submitted by the UNC, serves to prevent other investigations for substantiated charges of violations of the Armistice Agreement committed by the KPA and CPV.

9. It is obvious that the exercise of the full responsibilities of the NNSC is confined to the area of the UNC. In the territory under the military control of the KPA and the CPV, the NNSC has been unable to conduct investigations as provided for in the Armistice Agreement. The Czech and Polish members of the NNSC, and the Senior Member of the KPA and the CPV, MAC, have obstructed the work of the NNSC to date, and their recent statements appear to preclude the NNSC from ever performing all of its pledged obligations in the future. In view of the outright repudiation by the KPA and CPV of this portion of the Armistice Agreement, and the inability of the NNSC to carry out the obligations charged to it by the same agreement, the UNC considers that its rights as a signatory to the Armistice Agreement have been denied it. There is to date no indication that the NNSC either can or will fulfill, in the area under the military control of the KPA and CPV, the full obligations which its members undertook by accepting office on the NNSC. Neither has the NNSC acknowledged the fact that in prohibiting inspections lawfully requested by the UNC the KPA and CPV have in effect unilaterally abrogated that part of the Armistice Agreement applicable to the functions of the NNSC in the territory under the military control of the KPA and CPV.

J. K. LACEY, Maj. Gen. USAF,
Senior Member, USMAC.

U.S. Delegations to International Conferences

Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict

The Department of State announced on April 16 (press release 200) that the United States will be represented at

the Intergovernmental Conference on the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, to be held at The Hague from April 21 to May 12, 1954, by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, by the following delegation:

Chairman

Leonard Carmichael, Secretary, Smithsonian Institution.

Vice Chairman

Sumner McKnight Crosby, Associate Professor and Chairman, Department of History of Art, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Advisers

Magdalen G. H. Flexner, Office of Assistant Legal Adviser for Public Affairs, Department of State.

W. W. Perham, Colonel, U.S.A., Office of Civil Affairs and Military Government, Department of Defense.

Buddy A. Strozier, Colonel, U.S.A.F., Headquarters, United States Air Force in Europe, Wiesbaden, Germany.

This Conference has been called, pursuant to a resolution adopted at the Seventh Session of the General Conference of UNESCO (Paris, November 12-December 11, 1952), for the purpose of preparing and signing an International Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict.

Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration

The Department of State announced on April 20 (press release 205) that the following delegation will represent the United States at the seventh session of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration which convenes at Geneva, Switzerland, on April 26:

U.S. Representative

W. Hallam Tuck, Member Personnel Task Force for the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, Washington, D. C.

Alternate U.S. Representatives

Chauncey W. Reed, House of Representatives

Francis E. Walter, House of Representatives

Dorothy D. Houghton, Assistant Director, Office for Refugees, Migration and Voluntary Assistance, Foreign Operations Administration

Principal Adviser

George L. Warren, Adviser on Refugees and Displaced Persons, Department of State

Advisers

Walter M. Besterman, Staff Member, Committee on Judiciary, House of Representatives

Richard R. Brown, Director, Office of Field Coordination, Escapee Program, Foreign Operations Administration, Frankfurt, Germany

Albert F. Canwell, Spokane, Wash.

William R. Foley, Committee Counsel, Committee on Judiciary, House of Representatives

Dayton H. Frost, Chief, Intergovernmental Refugee Program Division, Foreign Operations Administration

Robert Hubbell, Labor Specialist, United States European Regional Organization, Foreign Operations Administration, Paris, France

During the week immediately preceding the convening of the seventh session, two subcommittees will hold meetings. The *Ad Hoc* Subcommittee on Draft Rules and Regulations will meet on April 20, 21, and 22. The Sub-

committee on Finance will hold its fifth session on April 23 and 24.

The purpose of the Intergovernmental Committee is to facilitate the movement out of Europe of refugees who would not otherwise be moved because of the termination of the International Refugee Organization. The countries of emigration are Austria, Germany, Greece, Italy, and the Netherlands. The members of the Intergovernmental Committee are Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Paraguay, Sweden, Switzerland, United States, and Venezuela.

Pan American Sanitary Organization

The Department of State announced on April 22 (press release 208) that the United States will be represented at the twenty-second session of the Executive Committee of the Pan American Sanitary Organization, beginning in Washington on April 22, by the following delegation:

Acting United States Representative

Frederick J. Brady, M. D., International Health Representative, Division of International Health, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Alternate United States Representative

Howard B. Calderwood, Office of United Nations Economic and Social Affairs, Department of State.

Advisers

Mary B. Trenary, Division of International Administration, Department of State.

C. L. Williams, M. D., Associate Director, Division of Health, Welfare and Housing, Institute of Inter-American Affairs, Foreign Operations Administration.

Simon N. Wilson, Office of Regional American Affairs, Department of State.

The Executive Committee was set up by a directive of the Twelfth Pan American Sanitary Conference held at Caracas in January 1947. The U.S. representative to the Committee, Dr. H. van Zile Hyde, is unable to attend this session.

The twenty-second meeting will consider such items as (1) the program and budget of the PASO for 1955; and (2) the relationship between PASO and nongovernmental organizations. In addition to the United States, the other member governments of the Executive Committee are Argentina, Brazil, Ecuador, Haiti, Mexico, and Panama.

TREATY INFORMATION

Military Assistance Agreement With Nicaragua

The Departments of State and Defense announced on April 24 the signing, in Managua, of a bilateral Military Assistance Agreement between the United States and Nicaragua.¹ Discussions

¹For text of the agreement, see Department of State press release 209 of Apr. 24.

regarding the agreement were begun with Nicaraguan officials in January of this year and were followed by recent formal negotiations in Managua which resulted in the signing of the agreement on April 23, 1954.

This agreement is consistent with, and conforms to, inter-American instruments already in effect, such as the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance (the Rio Treaty), the resolution on Inter-American Military Cooperation approved at the Washington Meeting of Foreign Ministers of 1951, and the continuous planning of the Inter-American Defense Board.

The agreement is the ninth of its kind to be signed between the United States and one of the other American Republics. Similar agreements, involving the provision of military grant aid by the United States to promote the defense of the Western Hemisphere, have been signed with Ecuador, Peru, Cuba, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Uruguay, and the Dominican Republic.²

These agreements were initiated under the program of military grant aid for Latin America, authorized in the Mutual Security Act of 1951. They illustrate the spirit of cooperation prevailing among the American Republics which makes it possible for them to concentrate, through self-help and mutual aid, upon increasing their ability to contribute to the collective defense of the Western Hemisphere.

U.S. and Japan Sign Tax Conventions

Press release 199 dated April 16

On April 16, 1954, Acting Secretary Smith and the Japanese Ambassador, Sadao Iguchi, signed two conventions between the United States and Japan for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion, one relating to taxes on income and the other relating to taxes on estates, inheritances, and gifts.

The provisions of those conventions follow, in general, the pattern of tax conventions entered into by the United States with a number of other countries. The conventions are designed, in the one case, to remove an undesirable impediment to international trade and economic development by doing away as far as possible with double taxation on the same income, and in the other case, to eliminate double taxation in connection with the settlement in one country of estates in which nationals of the other country have interests or in connection with the making of gifts.

²For text of the agreement with Ecuador, see BULLETIN of Mar. 3, 1952, p. 336.

So far as the United States is concerned, the conventions apply only with respect to United States (that is, Federal) taxes. They do not apply to the imposition of taxes by the several States, the District of Columbia, or the Territories or Possessions of the United States.

Under the terms of the conventions, they will be brought into force by the exchange of instruments of ratification. Meanwhile, each country will take such action as is necessary in accordance with its own constitutional procedures with a view to ratification. The conventions will be submitted to the United States Senate for advice and consent to ratification.

On the occasion of the signing of the conventions, notes were exchanged confirming an understanding regarding the application of certain provisions of the income-tax convention.

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Germany

Agreement on German external debts. Signed at London February 27, 1953. Entered into force September 16, 1953. TIAS 2792.

Ratifications deposited: Belgium—January 18, 1954 (including Belgian Congo and Ruanda-Urundi); Canada—November 14, 1953; Denmark—October 13, 1953; Iran—December 22, 1953; Ireland—November 12, 1953; Liechtenstein—December 31, 1953; Norway—October 8, 1953; Pakistan—October 27, 1953; Switzerland—December 31, 1953 (with a declaration); Union of South Africa—January 1, 1954;

Present agreement entered into force for the above countries on the dates of their respective deposits.

Labor

Convention (No. 74) concerning the certification of able seamen. Adopted at Seattle June 29, 1946. Entered into force July 14, 1951.

Ratification registered: United States of America—April 9, 1954

Present agreement entered into force for the United States on April 9, 1954.¹ Proclaimed by the President April 13, 1954.

Narcotic Drugs

Protocol bringing under international control drugs outside the scope of the convention of July 13, 1931 for limiting the manufacture and regulating the distribution of narcotic drugs, as amended by the protocol signed at Lake Success on December 11, 1946. Done at Paris November 19, 1948. Entered into force December 1, 1949; for the United States September 11, 1950. TIAS 2308.

¹ Also presently in force for Belgium, Canada, France, the Netherlands (including the Netherlands Antilles), Portugal, and the United Kingdom.

Extension to: Somaliland (notification by Italy given March 12, 1954)

Postal Matters

Universal postal convention, with final protocol, annex, regulations of execution, and provisions regarding air-mail and final protocol to the provisions regarding air-mail. Signed at Brussels July 11, 1952. Entered into force July 1, 1953. TIAS 2800.

Ratifications deposited: Austria—March 19, 1954; United Kingdom—March 11, 1954.

Application to: Channel Islands and Isle of Man (notification by the United Kingdom given March 11, 1954)

BILATERAL

El Salvador

Agreement for extension of agreement establishing a military aviation mission in El Salvador dated August 19, 1947 (TIAS 1633). Effected by exchange of notes at San Salvador December 2, 1953 and March 11, 1954. Entered into force March 11, 1954. To continue in force until December 31, 1955.

Japan

Agreement relating to the reduction of Japanese contributions under Article XXV of the Administrative Agreement of February 28, 1952 (TIAS 2492). Effected by exchange of notes at Tokyo April 6, 1954. Entered into force April 6, 1954.

STATUS LISTS¹

Agreement Between the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty Regarding the Status of Their Forces²

Signed at London June 19, 1951 by Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America.

| State | Date of deposit of instrument of ratification | Date of entry into force |
|--------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| France | Sept. 29, 1952 | Aug. 23, 1953 |
| Norway | Feb. 24, 1953 | Aug. 23, 1953 |
| Belgium | Feb. 27, 1953 ³ | Aug. 23, 1953 |
| United States of America | July 24, 1953 ⁴ | Aug. 23, 1953 |
| Canada | Aug. 28, 1953 | Sept. 27, 1953 |
| Netherlands | Nov. 18, 1953 ⁴ | Dec. 18, 1953 |
| Luxembourg | Mar. 19, 1954 ⁴ | Apr. 18, 1954 |

² As of Apr. 20, 1954.

³ Declaration by the Governments of Belgium, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands regarding this agreement signed June 19, 1951.

⁴ Instrument of ratification included the declaration of June 19, 1951.

⁵ Instrument of ratification included a statement.

**Protocol on the Status of
International Military Headquarters Set Up
Pursuant to the North Atlantic Treaty⁶**

Signed at Paris August 25, 1952 by Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America.

| State | Date of deposit of instrument of ratification | Date of entry into force |
|--------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| Norway | Feb. 24, 1953 | Apr. 10, 1954 |
| Iceland | May 11, 1953 | Apr. 10, 1954 |
| United States of America | July 24, 1953 | Apr. 10, 1954 |
| Belgium | Mar. 11, 1954 ⁷ | Apr. 10, 1954 |

THE DEPARTMENT

Designations

Samuel D. Boykin as Chief, Division of Biographic Information, effective April 12.

Robert R. Robbins as Deputy Director, Office of Dependent Area Affairs, effective April 11.

FOREIGN SERVICE

Appointment

Charles D. Hilles, Jr., as special legal adviser to the U.S. High Commissioner for Germany, effective April 19 (press release 204).

Confirmation

The Senate on April 9 confirmed the nomination of Edward B. Lawson to be Ambassador to Israel.

⁶ Declaration by the Governments of Belgium, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands regarding this protocol signed at Brussels June 20, 1953.

⁷ Instrument of ratification included the declaration of June 20, 1953.

THE CONGRESS

**Current Legislation on Foreign Policy
83d Congress, 2d Session**

To Provide for the Orderly Settlement of Certain Claims Arising out of Acts or Omissions of Civilian Employees and Military Personnel of the United States in Foreign Countries and of Civilian Employees and Military Personnel of Foreign Countries in the United States. Hearings before the Subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on H. R. 7819. March 18 and 19, 1954, 56 pp.

Extension of Emergency Foreign Merchant Vessel Acquisition and Operating Authority. Report to accompany S. 2371. S. Rept. 1087, March 24, 1954, 12 pp.

Providing Transportation on Canadian Vessels. Report to accompany S. 2777. S. Rept. 1089, March 24, 1954, 2 pp.

Use of Nonappropriated Funds by Executive Agencies (Bonn-Bad Godesberg Area Construction Program). Eleventh Intermediate Report of the Committee on Government Operations. H. Rept. 1387, March 24, 1954, 25 pp.

Passamaquoddy International Tidal Power Project. Report of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on S. J. Res. 12, a Resolution Requesting a Survey of the Proposed Passamaquoddy Tidal Power Project. H. Rept. 1413, March 24, 1954, IV, 6 pp.

Hospitalization in the Philippines. Report to accompany H. R. 8044. H. Rept. 1414, March 24, 1954, 11 pp.

Amending Sections 3185 and 3186 of Title 18, United States Code. Report to accompany H. R. 2556. H. Rept. 1416, March 25, 1954, 10 pp.

Claims for Damages, Audited Claims, and Judgments Rendered Against the United States. Communication from the President of the United States Transmitting a Proposed Supplemental Appropriation to Pay Claims for Damages, Audited Claims, and Judgments Rendered Against the United States, as Provided by Various Laws, Amounting to \$1,553,745. S. Doc. 110, March 29, 1954, 18 pp.

International Contingencies—Department of State. Communication from the President of the United States Transmitting a Proposed Draft of a Proposed Provision Pertaining to the Fiscal Year 1954 for the Department of State International Contingencies. S. Doc. 111, March 31, 1954, 2 pp.

Providing for the Admissibility in Certain Criminal Proceedings of Evidence Obtained by Interception of Communications. Report to accompany H. R. 8649. H. Rept. 1461, April 1, 1954, 6 pp.

Naturalization of Former Citizens of the United States Who Have Lost United States Citizenship by Voting in a Political Election or Plebiscite Held in Occupied Japan. Report to accompany S. 1303. S. Rept. 1178, April 5, 1954, 7 pp.

Fuel Investigation: Venezuelan Petroleum. Progress Report of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce Pursuant to H. Res. 127, 83d Congress. H. Rept. 1487, April 6, 1954, 18 pp.

A Fiscal Analysis of the International Operations of the United States for the Fiscal Years 1953, 1954, and 1955. Thirteenth Intermediate Report of the House Committee on Government Operations. H. Rept. 1505, April 7, 1954, 10 pp.

German Consulate-America House Program (Part 2). Fourteenth Intermediate Report of the House Committee on Government Operations. H. Rept. 1506, April 7, 1954, 12 pp.

| | |
|---|-----|
| American Principles. Americans Abroad (Colligan) . . . | 663 |
| American Republics. Observance of Pan American Day (Holland) . . . | 675 |
| Atomic Energy | |
| A First Step Toward the Peaceful Use of Atomic Energy (Strauss) . . . | 659 |
| The Search for Means of Controlling Atomic Energy (Lodge) . . . | 687 |
| Belgium. Registration of Belgian and Congolese Securities . . . | 673 |
| Claims and Property. Formal Claim Filed Against Guatemalan Government . . . | 678 |
| Congress. The. Current Legislation . . . | 694 |
| Ecuador. Conciliation of Boundary Dispute Between Peru and Ecuador . . . | 678 |
| Educational Exchange. Americans Abroad (Colligan) . . | 663 |
| Europe. U. S. Loan to European Coal and Steel Community (text of communiqué) . . . | 671 |
| Foreign Service | |
| Appointment. Hilles . . . | 694 |
| Confirmation. Lawson . . . | 694 |
| Greece. FOA Allots Funds to Greece and the Netherlands . . . | 674 |
| Guatemala. Formal Claim Filed Against Guatemalan Government . . . | 678 |
| Indochina. Conversations in London and Paris Concerning Indochina (Dulles) . . . | 668 |
| International Information. The Quest for Truth Through Freedom of Information (Hotchkis) . . . | 682 |
| International Organizations and Meetings | |
| Calendar of Meetings . . . | 680 |
| Conversations in London and Paris Concerning Indochina (Dulles) . . . | 668 |
| Meeting of NAC Ministers (text of communiqué) . . | 670 |
| Secretary Dulles Leaves for Paris and Geneva (Dulles) . | 669 |
| U. S. Delegations to International Conferences . . . | 691 |
| U. S. and Mexico Discuss Broadcasting Problems . . . | 678 |
| Japan. U. S. and Japan Sign Tax Conventions . . . | 692 |
| Korea. Armistice Agreement Violations (Lacey) . . . | 689 |
| Mexico. U. S. and Mexico Discuss Broadcasting Problems . . . | 678 |
| Military Affairs | |
| Armistice Agreement Violations (Lacey) . . . | 689 |
| Military Assistance Agreement with Nicaragua . . . | 692 |
| Mutual Security | |
| FOA Allots Funds to Greece and the Netherlands . . . | 674 |
| U. S. Loan to European Coal and Steel Community (text of communiqué) . . . | 671 |
| Voluntary Agencies to Aid in Technical Cooperation Program (Stassen) . . . | 674 |
| Netherlands. FOA Allots Funds to Greece and the Netherlands . . . | 674 |
| Nicaragua. Military Assistance Agreement with Nicaragua . . . | 692 |
| Peru. Conciliation of Boundary Dispute Between Peru and Ecuador . . . | 678 |
| Protection of Nationals and Property. Registration of Belgian and Congolese Securities . . . | 673 |
| Refugees and Displaced Persons. U. S. Protests Actions of Soviet Union in Germany (Dowling note to Semenov) . . . | 671 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| State, Department of | |
| Designations. Boykin, Robbins . . . | 694 |
| Treaty Information | |
| Conciliation of Boundary Dispute Between Peru and Ecuador . . . | 678 |
| Current Actions . . . | 693 |
| Military Assistance Agreement with Nicaragua . . . | 692 |
| U. S. and Japan Sign Tax Conventions . . . | 692 |
| United Nations | |
| Confirmation. Baker . . . | 686 |
| Current U. N. Documents . . . | 679 |
| The Quest for Truth Through Freedom of Information (Hotchkis) . . . | 682 |
| The Search for Means of Controlling Atomic Energy (Lodge) . . . | 687 |
| U. S. S. R. U. S. Protests Actions of Soviet Union in Germany (Dowling note to Semenov) . . . | 671 |

Name Index

| | |
|---------------------------------|----------|
| Baker, George P. | 686 |
| Boykin, Samuel D. | 694 |
| Carmichael, Leonard | 691 |
| Colligan, Francis J. | 663 |
| Dowling, Walter | 671 |
| Dulles, Secretary | 668, 669 |
| Glacchero, Enzo | 673 |
| Hilles, Charles D., Jr. | 694 |
| Holland, Henry F. | 675 |
| Hotchkis, Preston | 682 |
| Lacey, J. K. | 689 |
| Lawson, Edward B. | 694 |
| Lodge, Henry Cabot, Jr. | 687 |
| Monnet, Jean | 672 |
| Potthoff, Heinz | 672 |
| Robbins, Robert R. | 694 |
| Smith, Walter B. | 672 |
| Stassen, Harold E. | 674 |
| Strauss, Lewis L. | 659 |

Check List of Department of State Press Releases: April 19-25

Releases may be obtained from the News Division, Department of State, Washington 25, D. C.

Press releases issued prior to April 19 which appear in this issue of the BULLETIN are Nos. 179 of April 5, 195 and 196 of April 13, and 199 and 200 of April 16.

| No. | Date | Subject |
|-----|------|---|
| 203 | 4/19 | Peru-Ecuador boundary conciliation |
| 204 | 4/19 | Hilles appointment (rewrite) |
| 205 | 4/20 | Delegation to Migration Committee |
| 206 | 4/20 | Claim for land expropriation in Guatemala |
| 207 | 4/20 | Dulles: Departure for Paris, Geneva |
| 208 | 4/22 | Delegation to Executive Committee of Pan American Sanitary Organization |
| 209 | 4/24 | Military Assistance Agreement, Nicaragua (rewrite) |
| 210 | 4/23 | Loan to Coal and Steel Community |
| 211 | 4/23 | Holders of Belgian and Congolese securities |
| 212 | 4/23 | Remarks by Smith, Monnet |

Foreign Relations of the United States . . .
the basic source of information on U.S. diplomatic history

1936, Volume IV, The Far East



the Department of State

This volume is divided into three main sections: The Far Eastern Crisis, China, Japan. There is also a short section on Siam (Thailand).

Reports on conditions in the Far East which form a background for the later outbreak of war comprise the major portion of this volume. Direct negotiations between the United States and Far Eastern governments in 1936 were of relatively minor importance save for those connected with Japan's withdrawal from the London Naval Conference (recorded in *Foreign Relations, 1936, Volume I, General, The British Commonwealth and Foreign Relations, Japan 1931-1941, Volume I*).

While 1936 was a period of relative inactivity in Japan's extension of power in China, evaluations of the situation by American diplomats showed that they were not lulled into any delusion that Japanese aggressive aims were ended.

Two dramatic incidents of especial significance, one in Japan and one in China, are reported on at length in this volume. The first was the outbreak by an army group who on February 26 assassinated a number of high Japanese officials. The second was the detention by force of Chiang Kai-shek at Sian, December 12-25, to bring pressure upon him for leading united Chinese resistance to Japan.

Copies of this volume may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C. for \$4.50 each.

Order Form

To: Supt. of Documents
Govt. Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

Enclosed find:

\$
(cash, check, or
money order).

Please send me copies of *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1936, Volume IV, The Far East*.

Name:

Street Address:

City, Zone, and State: